

# The Classical Review

APRIL 1898.

ATHENA POLIAS AT ATHENS.

THE application of the title Athena Polias at Athens has been matter of controversy in recent years. Dr. Dörpfeld (*Mittheil. d. k. deutsch. arch. Inst. Athen. Abth.* xii. [1887] 25 sqq., 192 sqq., 276 sqq.) has maintained that Athena of the Parthenon was called Athena Polias; on the other hand Mr. J. G. Frazer (*J.H.S.* xiii. p. 153 sqq.) and Prof. J. W. White (*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vi. p. 1 sqq.) agree that the term Polias designated only Athena of the Erechtheum or of the temple that preceded the Erechtheum on the same site. I desire to draw attention to a peculiarity in the language of Athenian inscriptions which, as far as I know, has not yet been pointed out, and to prove that under certain conditions Athenian official documents applied the epithet Polias to the goddess who occupied the Parthenon.

I will begin with the fourth century. The evidence principally consists of the inventories of treasures of various kinds, which were made out and inscribed on stone every year by the ten Treasurers of Athena. Now, if the chambers of the Parthenon had contained nothing but the property of the goddess of that temple, the officials would have had no occasion to mention 'Athena' or 'the goddess' in the body of their catalogues. But this was not the case; votive offerings belonging to a number of gods and goddesses were at different times deposited in the 'great temple,' and it was the duty of the Treasurers to keep separate and distinct the possessions of the various deities. Even this end might have been attained without introducing Athena's name. The cataloguers

NO. CIV. VOL. XII.

might have kept to a settled plan of specifying the owner of an article only when it did not belong to the goddess of the temple. The lists of the fifth century were composed on this principle, and followed a fixed order, so that they were open to no misconstruction. In the fourth century this continuity and system disappeared, and the disposition of the treasures was subject to frequent changes, the causes of which are in the main unknown. One result of these shiftings was that the Treasurers sometimes thought it desirable to state that this or that article in the inventory was sacred to 'Athena' or to 'the goddess.' A comparison of some inscriptions will show the nature of such exceptional circumstances.

Consider the language and order of the following extracts from the *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum*:

(1) Π. 660 (390–89 B.C.), l. 39, ἐγγραμμά-  
τευεν, ἀνέσθεν· ἄγει ἡ ὑπάργυρος ΗΓΓΓΓΙΠ|||  
Ἀρτέμι[δος Βραυρωνίας χρυσίδες . . . (about  
24 letters), l. 40, . . . (room for 8 letters,  
weight here indicated)]. Ἀθηναίαις χρυσίδες  
τρεῖς καὶ κοινωλιδόν· στέφανος . . . (about  
41 letters to end of line).

(2) II. 661, fr. d., l. 7, ἐγράμμα]τενε, ἀνέ-  
θηκεν· Ἀρτέμιδος Βρανωνί· l. 8, [-as χρυσίδες  
. . . (about 31 letters)· Ἀθηναίαις] χρυσίδες  
τρῆς καὶ κονδυλωτὸν ἐν· ἄ[στατα ταῦτα (?)

(3) II. 652, A. (398/7 B.C.), l. 49, *καρχή-  
σιον Διὸς Πολῶς ἀργυροῦν* with weight, then  
*Ἀρτέμιδος Βραυρωνίας χρυσίδ-* l. 50, *-ες* . . .  
(about 32 letters). *Ἀθηναίης χρυσίδες* III [ . . .

(4) IV. II. 652b. (p. 176), ll. 3-4, a golden crown dedicated by Lysander (which appears in ll. 14-15 of ii. 660) then in l. 4 [Ἀρτέμιδος Βρα], l. 5, -υρωρίας χρυσίδες [. . .] (about 26 letters to end of line), l. 6 |---| Then in ll. 6, 7, 8, 9 and part of 10, two golden crowns (which appear in ll. 15-16 of ii. 652), and a golden ring (which appears in ll. 39-40 of ii. 652); next, l. 10, χρυσίδες τρεῖς καὶ [κοινδ]- l. 11, -υλωτὸν ἐν· στέφανος θαλλοῦ (a name here omitted by the mason) Δαμπτρεὺς ἀνέθηκεν, στάθμον τοῦτων κ.τ.λ.

The restoration of these inscriptions is due to the patience and acuteness of Koehler and Lolling and is, in my judgment, certainly right. We have before us the same articles but not in the same order. This is the reason why in (4) l. 10, the name of Athena was not given, whereas in (1) l. 40 the addition Ἀθηναίας was, if not absolutely necessary, at any rate convenient and sensible. In (1) two sets of χρυσίδες were taken in succession, and since those of Artemis of Brauron were entered first, it was useful and conducive to clearness to note that the second set belonged to Athena. No such specification would have been required if Athena's property had been put down in the catalogue before the property of Artemis of Brauron. In (4) no confusion could arise, because between the χρυσίδες of Artemis in l. 5 and the χρυσίδες of Athena in l. 10 were interposed articles of a different kind fully described; hence the Treasurers did not waste space in l. 10 by the superfluous insertion of Ἀθηναίας before χρυσίδες. The principle may be applied to other places, where 'Athena' or 'the goddess' is mentioned. Thus it may be that in ii. 678, A. i. ll. 17-18, we find [στέφανος] χρυσοῦς τῆς θεοῦ ἀριστεῖον [ἐκ Παναθη]ναίων τῶ[ν] ἐπὶ Ναυσιν[ί]κου [ἀρχοντος] because the preceding crown was dedicated to Athena Nike (l. 15, [Ἀθηναί]κη στέφανος ἀπὸ Λήων.). Note also the sequence in ii. 701, col. i. (ii.) l. 46, φιάλη χρυσή Ἀθηναί[ς] Ν[ίκης], ll. 46-7, φιάλ[αι] χρυσ[αί] Αἰδιοπίδες (in a different position ii. 678, A. i. l. 13), ll. 48-9, φιάλ[αι] χρυσ[αί]. . . οὐχ ὑγ[ί]αις Ἀθηναί[ς] στάθμον, ll. 59-60, φιάλ[αι] χρυσ[αί] τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν, and compare ii. 737, A. ii. 30 (a list of silver vessels, probably φιάλ[αι], first those of Athena, ἐφ' αἷς ἐπιγέγραπται· ἱεραὶ Ἀθηναί[ς], then those of Asclepius, then those of Artemis of Brauron), ii. 725, A. (gold cups belonging to Athena, ἱεραὶ Ἀθηναί[ς], followed by gold cups of Asclepius and of Artemis of Brauron), and ii. 668, 19-20 (χρυσίδες φιάλ[αι] τῆς θεοῦ). In ii. 660, l. 50, and ii. 667, l. 42, (παρακαταθήκη Ἀθηναίας) it is probable that a

like explanation holds good (see ii. 661, ll. 18-9), but the context is too imperfect to justify confidence.

These petty details of official inventories repay attention, because they furnish a proof that the goddess of the Parthenon was upon occasion styled Polias, and so render us the service of terminating a controversy. Several lists contain a set of silver hydriae, entered without the owner's name. In ii. 660, ll. 23-32, twenty-seven of these vessels are enumerated and the weight of each recorded; they follow in the catalogue καρχήσιον Διὸς Πολιέως ἀργυροῦν, and precede οἰνοχοαὶ ἀργυραὶ τρεῖς (which in ii. 652, A. 30, ii. 667, 23, are in a different place), and are introduced with these words: ὑδρίαὶ ἀργ[υραί]· πρώτης στάθμον. That the name of a god or goddess was not inserted after ἀργυραί is shown by ii. 661, l. 4, (ὑδ)ρίαὶ ἀργυραί· [πρώτῃ] στάθμον and by ii. 695, l. 10, [ὑδρίαὶ] ἀργυραί, blank, l. 11, [πρώτῃ] στάθμον. The inscriptions quoted are records of treasures stored in what was called ὁ νεὸς ὁ ἑκατόμπεδος, i.e., in a chamber which is generally considered part of Pericles' great temple. Consequently the silver hydriae in question belonged to the goddess who owned this chamber, for, if they had been dedicated to another deity, this fact would have been stated. Now, other catalogues present these twenty-seven hydriae belonging, as we see, to Athena of the Parthenon, in a different connexion, grouped together with hydriae of other gods and goddesses. In ii. 677, i. 9-35, we discover twelve of Athena's hydriae (from the 15th to the 27th), then three new ones (ὑδρίαὶ ἀργυραὶ καιναί), and next to these, l. 38, [Ἀθηνα]ίας Νίκης [ὑδ]ρίαὶ (four). How, under these circumstances, did the list of the twenty-seven begin? From ii. 677 this cannot be learned, but the answer is given by ii. 678, A. ii. l. 11, ὑδρίαὶ ἀργυραὶ Ἀθη[ν]ᾶς Π[ολι]ᾶ[ς] [δ]ος, l. 12, πρώτη στάθμον κ.τ.λ. Further evidence is provided by ii. 699, col. ii. The order here differs in one respect from the arrangement in ii. 677. Athena's twenty-seven hydriae were put first, the record of the last four being preserved, but for some reason the Treasurers postponed the new ones, which came next in ii. 677, and continued as follows: l. 5 [Ἀθ]ηνᾶς Ν[ίκης] ὑδρίαὶ (four), l. 12, Ἀρ[τ]έμιδος Βραυρωνίας ὑδρίαὶ (seven), l. 21 [Δη]μήτρου καὶ Φερ[ε]φ[ά]της [ὑδρίαὶ] (five), l. 29, Ἀφροδίτης ὑδρία (one), l. 30, Ἀνάκον ὑδρία (three). At the close of the whole list, l. 36, a note was appended concerning Athena's new or restored hydriae: [αὖ]ται [καί]ναι Ἀθηναί[ς] Π[ολι]ᾶ[ς] [δ]ος, l. 37, [πρώτῃ] στάθμον ὃ ἔγενετο πρότερον. The reason

for the appearance of the epithet Polias in ii. 678 and ii. 699 is obvious; the officials desired that the vessels owned by Athena of the Parthenon should be clearly distinguished from the vessels belonging to Athena Nike. There is, however, a difference between the two cases; in ii. 699 the word Polias is indispensable, in ii. 678 it is only a matter of convenience. Observe the treatment of this point in ii. 673, where the silver hydriae are mixed up with other articles: l. 13, ]|· 'Αθηνάας ὑδρί[α, ll. 14-16, two censers and something of gold, l. 17, ]καὶ συνάρχουσιν· Νίκης ὑδρία, l. 19, 'Αρτέμιδος Βρ[αυρωνίας ὑδρία.

In the fourth century, then, the Treasurers used the combination Athena Polias with a quite definite object, to guard against confusion with Athena Nike. The adjective was not affixed to distinguish Athena of the Erechtheum from Athena of the Parthenon. The inscriptions of the fifth century exhibit the same practice. The most important piece of evidence is *C.I.A.* i. 273, which records the vast loans, about 5,550t., made to the state from the wealth of Athena and other gods and goddesses in the eleven years from 433-2 B.C. to 423-2 B.C. I assume the general correctness of the reconstruction and interpretation presented in the *Corpus*, which, so far as I am aware, have never been impugned, at any rate in essentials. The language of the following extracts should be observed: l. 50, [κεφάλαιον τόκο χρεώσαντος 'Αθ[ηναί]ας ἐν τοῖς τέτταρσιν ἔτεσιν ἐκ Παν[αθηναίων] ἐς Πα[ναθηναία]. l. 51... 'Αθ[ηναί]ας Νίκης ἐπὶ τῆς 'Ακαμαντίδ[ος] πρυτανείας (debt and interest). ll. 96-7, [τάδε λογιζάντο οἱ λογιστ[αί] ἐν τοῖς τέτταρσιν ἔτεσιν τόκον τοῖς τῆς θεῶ ἃ οἱ πρό[τε]ροι λογιστ[αί] λελογισμένα παρέδωσαν (ἐν τοῖς ἔπτα ἔτεσιν). l. 100, debt and interest due to 'the other gods.' ll. 104-5, ...s 'Αθ[ηναί]ας Νίκης ἐν τοῖς τέτταρσιν ἔτεσιν ἃ οἱ πρό[τε]ροι λογιστ[αί] λελογισμένα παρέδωσαν (ἐν τοῖς ἔπτα ἔτεσιν). l. 113, 'Αθ[ηναί]ας Νίκης καὶ Πολιάδος (a sum of money in figures). l. 114, Πολιάδος καὶ Νίκης τόκο (a sum of money in figures). Here the Πολιάς of ll. 113 and 114 is not different from ἡ θεὸς of l. 96 and 'Αθ[ηναί]α of l. 50. The substance of the document puts the identification beyond reach of doubt. The debt to Athena Polias and Athena Nike, which was recorded in l. 113, was 4777 t. 3248 dr. 2 ob. Of this only 28 t. 3548 dr. 2 ob. was borrowed from Athena Nike. The remainder, 4748 t. 5700 dr., was the debt to the 'Polias,' which consisted of the monies called in l. 96, τὰ τῆς θεῶ, 4001 t. 1522 dr., and of the loans from 'Athena' added up in l. 50, viz. 747 t.

4178 dr. Many scholars will doubtless consider this calculation superfluous, since every student of this document has hitherto taken for granted that the 'Polias' is 'the goddess' or 'Athena.' But it is not really irrelevant to the argument to insist on the enormous wealth of Athena Polias. Athena Polias, as her riches show, represents the Athenian Empire. She is 'the goddess' (*C.I.A.* i. 260) to whom the first-fruits of the tribute were paid. She is 'Athena,' who drew large revenues from the spoils of war, and to whom her chosen people (οἱ τρώφιμοι) set apart sacred domains (τεμένη, *C.I.A.* iv. 3, 528, p. 157) wherever they made conquests. What is the significance of Pericles' Parthenon, if it was not designed to be a new and splendid home for the tutelary goddess who had so signally blessed Athens? Is it credible that the 'great temple' built in part, as the allies complained, out of money paid as tribute, did not house the goddess, who received every year part of that tribute as a thank-offering? The advocates of the doctrine that Athena Polias was the goddess of the Erechtheum, and of the Erechtheum only, fail to remove this serious objection. Thus Prof. White (*op. cit.* p. 37) writes as follows: 'It was doubtless the purpose of Pericles to transfer the worship of Athena Polias to the Parthenon. (That may have been the purpose also of the builders of the Hecatompedon in an earlier age.) But conservative religious feeling and party strife combined to thwart him. The Parthenon was built, but his intention was frustrated.' Prof. White is of course thinking only of the cult of Athena Polias, which he considers to have been confined to the Erechtheum, on evidence which seems to me insufficient, but this only makes his admission of the purpose of Pericles more significant; he cannot suppress the feeling that the building of the Parthenon is hard to explain if the new temple was not meant for the worship of the guardian goddess of Athens. Yet he cites no ancient authorities in proof of the statement that Pericles' design was defeated by 'conservative religious feeling and party strife.' In my judgment the few facts known point to the conclusion that Athena Polias was not only set up in gold and ivory, but was honoured by worship, in the Parthenon.

Another financial inscription of the fifth century must be quoted and examined, because it has apparently led a scholar so careful and solid as Prof. Busolt, to whom all students of Greek History are deeply indebted, to desert or modify what I believe

to be the only true doctrine. In the second volume of his *History of Greece* (ii.<sup>2</sup> p. 339, n. 1.) citing among other authorities *C.I.A.* i. 273 he accepted the view which I am attempting to corroborate, that 'the goddess worshipped in the "Athena temple" was no less "Polias" than the goddess worshipped in the "Polias cella" of the Erechtheum.' But in the third volume recently published (iii. 1, p. 216, n. 1.) he seems to embrace the opposite theory. His words are these: 'Besides the property of Athena in the great temple, the Treasurers administered the property of Athena Nike and of Athena in the Erechtheum, who was styled officially Athena Polias and so distinguished from Athena unqualified, the proper tutelary goddess of the state.' This statement is put forward in explanation of *C.I.A.* i. 188. The inscription contains a series of payments amounting to more than 180 t.—to be exact to 178 t. 3864 dr. 2½ ob. + x—which were made in 410–9 B.C. (*Ol.* 92. 3.) by the Treasurers of Athena; and it is necessary to quote in full ll. 2–7, the part that has perplexed critics: ταμίαι ἱερῶν χρημάτων τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς Καλλίστρατος Μαραθῆνιος καὶ χσυνάρχοντες παρέδοσαν ἐκ τῶν ἐπετείων φεφεμισμένον τὸ δέμου ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰαντίδος πρότερος πρυτανεῦσες, Ἑλλενοταμίαις παρέδωκε: Καλλιμάχοι Ἀγροσίοι, Φρασιτελίδει Ἰκαριεῖ: ἵπποις σίτος ἐδόθη: Ἀθηνᾶς Πολιάδος (3 t. 3237 dr. ½ ob.) Νίκης: (91 dr. 3¼ ob.): ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰγείδος δευτέρως πρυτανεῦσες: ἀθλοθέταις παρέδωκε ἐς Παναθήναια τὰ μεγάλα: Φίλοισι Κυθαθεναιεῖ καὶ συνάρχουσιν, Ἀθηνᾶς Πολιάδος: (5 t. 100 dr.): ἱεροποιοῖς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν: Δούλλοι Ἐρχιεῖ καὶ συνάρχουσιν, ἐς τὴν ἑκατόμβην (5114 dr.). In the remainder of the inscription neither Athena Polias nor Athena Nike is mentioned. This circumstance has given rise to various conjectures. Dr. Beloch (*Rh. Mus.* 39, (1884) p. 58 *sqq.*) objects on various grounds to Kirchhoff's view that the phrase ἐκ τῶν ἐπετείων refers to drafts on temple revenues, and in particular argues that the addition of Ἀθηνᾶς Πολιάδος or Νίκης to three payments is a 'clear proof' that whenever these additions are absent we have to do with money belonging to the state, not to the goddess. Prof. Busolt rejects this conclusion and substitutes another explanation, that the words in question are annexed to the three payments because the rest of the money, as much as 170 t., comes from the treasures of Athena of the Parthenon. Consequently he is driven to the supposition that Athena Polias, the goddess of the Erechtheum, was poor, and in fact uses this inference as an argument against a restora-

tion in *C.I.A.* iv. 3, 179 c. (p. 162). The supplement proposed in the *Corpus* [Πολιάδος Π] is wrong, he observes, first, because there is not room, which is true, secondly, because 'the Polias in the Erechtheum' had not at her disposal a sum as large as 77 t. 2034 dr. 4 ob., the total made up, if 50 t. be inserted in the gap. Now there can be no doubt that the Polias of i. 273 is rich, and it is very improbable that Πολιάς means one thing in i. 273, and another thing in i. 188. The error is to be sought in the interpretation of the latter inscription. Is it not more likely that the officials of the fifth century used the title Athena Polias in the same way and for the same purpose as their successors in the fourth century? In l. 5 Ἀθηνᾶς Πολιάδος was added merely for the sake of perspicuity, because a draft upon Ἀθηνᾶ Νίκε was to follow immediately. I believe also that the second mention of Athena Polias was produced by the first and was not absolutely necessary, since a contemporary reading the monument with ordinary care would have understood from the praescript that the money came from Athena, unless the contrary was stated; but this is just what Dr. Beloch would deny, and I do not know how to convince him. This point, however, affects in no way my present argument. With regard to the *usus uerborum* it should be remarked that the Treasurers might have begun with Ἀθηνᾶς unqualified, and continued with Ἀθηνᾶς Νίκης as in i. 273, 50, but that the form chosen is much neater; also, that they might have omitted in the first place Ἀθηνᾶς, if in the second they had given in full Ἀθηνᾶς Νίκης. Traces of this latter style can be found in another financial inscription of the fifth century, i. 189a, which preserves an account of thirteen payments 'for the Diobelia' made to the Hellenotamiae and their assessors in the second Prytany of a year which according to Kirchhoff was 407–6 B.C., *Ol.* 93, 2. Here in l. 3 Waddington finds on the stone, which is in the Louvre, ἐς τὴν διοβελίαν Ἀθηνᾶ[ι] Νίκε □..... This Kirchhoff accepts, and suggests that the extraordinary and very suspicious dative may refer to a largess granted in honour of Athena Nike. But Froehner gives ἐς τὴν διοβελίαν Ἀθηνᾶς [...], considering the rest undecipherable, and Dittenberger (*S.I.G.* 44 b.) follows him, proposing Ἀθηνᾶς [Νίκης]. There is a similar difficulty in ll. 6–7, where Kirchhoff after Waddington has ἐς τὴν διοβελίαν Ἀθηνᾶι Νίκε ΠΠΠΠΠ κ.τ.λ., but Ditten-



berger after Froehner ἐς τὴν διοβελίαν ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύβος ΤΤΠΠΗΗΗΗ κ.τ.λ. In these two passages Dittenberger's text seems to give a better sense, but in l. 19, where Kirchhoff and Waddington read 'Αθελ(α)ι [N]ίκει ΠΠΠ, I think Dittenberger wrong in accepting from Froehner ἐς τὴν διοβελίαν 'Αθελίας ΤΤΧΗΗΠΠΠ, because in accounts of this kind I can discover nothing resembling this isolated mention of Athena: what is the true reading is another question. In i. 177, 8 the restoration of the context of 'Αθελίας π[ ] is uncertain. In i. 191, ll. 1, 7, 8, 9 where 'Αθελίας occurs four times, it is probable that Athena was opposed to Athena Nike; thus in l. 8 we have 'Αθελίας Κυ[ ]κρηνοὶ στατήρες, and in l. 9 we should restore 'Αθ[ ]ελίας Νίκης. The doubt about the supplement in iv. 3, 179 c. (p. 162) has already been noticed.

The use of 'Αθελία Νίκη, when neither 'Αθελία nor 'Αθελία Πολιάς has been expressed in the preceding clause is shown very clearly in Kirchhoff's revision of i. 184, 185 after Mr. E. L. Hicks' more accurate copy of the stone given in *Grk. Inser. from the Brit. Mus.* i. xxiv. pp. 51-2. He now presents B. ll. 20-25 in the following form (iv. 1, p. 34):—

1. 20. [τὸ ἐπετείο]  
 ὁ αὐτοὶ χ[ ]συνελέχσαμεν  
 ἀργυρίο Π[ ]  
 || III. 'Αθελ[ ]ίας Νίκης τὸ ἐπε-  
 τείο ὁ αὐ[ ]τοὶ χσυνελέχσα[ ]  
 1. 25. -μεν ἀρχυ[ ]ρίο . . . . .]

In l. 20 'Αθελίας did not stand before the lacuna, and yet few, I think, will doubt that ll. 20-22 stated Athena's revenue in silver, which in this year (411-10 according to the conjectures of Boeckh and Kirchhoff) was less than 100 t. Similarly in the earlier part of this inscription, A. l. 15, from the phrase 'Αθελίας Νίκες, it may be guessed that the sum of money which precedes came from the resources of Athena. In B. ll. 26-28 I am dissatisfied with Kirchhoff's restoration because twenty-two letters are given to l. 27, and have thought of restoring the passage differently:

1. 26. σύμ[ ]παντος κεφάλαιον]  
 1. 27. τὸ ἀργυ[ ]ρίο τὸ τῆς Πολιάδ[ ]  
 1. 28. [ο]ς καὶ τ[ ]ὸ τῆς Νίκης. . . . .]

But I fear that the problem is at present insoluble.

So far, only catalogues and accounts of the Treasurers have been adduced to show that the title Polias cannot be denied to the goddess of the Parthenon. The point can be established in another way and with the help of an inscription of a different kind. In *C.I.A.* iv., ii. 109 b (p. 37) will be found a decree of the Assembly passed in the eighth prytany of 347-6 B.C. (Ol. 108, 2) in honour of Spartocus and Pairisades, sons of Leucon, prince of the Bosphorus. The mover, Androction, familiar to us from the invectives of Demosthenes' client Diodorus, proposed that the Athenian people should grant them the privileges previously conferred on Satyrus and Leucon, and crown each of them with a golden crown worth 1,000 dr. at the great Panathenaea. The crowns were to be an institution, and the athlothetae were instructed to get them made in the year before the great Panathenaea; for the approaching celebration in Hecatombaeon 346 B.C. special provisions were inserted. The resolution proceeds thus, ll. 29-39: καὶ ἀναγορεύειν ὅτι στεφανοὶ ὁ δῆμος ὁ 'Αθελίων Σπάρτοκον καὶ Παιρισάδην τοὺς Λεύκωνος παῖδας ἀρετῆς καὶ εὐνοίας ἔνεκα τῆς εἰς τὸν δῆμον τὸν 'Αθελίων. ἐπειδὴ δὲ τοὺς στεφάνους ἀνατιθέασι τῇ 'Αθελίᾳ τῇ Πολιάδι, τοὺς ἀθλοθέτας εἰς τὸν νεὼ ἀνατιθέναι τοὺς στεφάνους ἐπιγράφαντας Σπάρτοκος καὶ Παιρισάδης Λεύκωνος παῖδες ἀνέθεσαν τῇ 'Αθελίᾳ στεφανωθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ δῆμου τοῦ 'Αθελίων. Here Athena Polias is surely the same as Athena without the epithet. But is this all? Is not 'the temple' the temple of Athena Polias? Where then were crowns of this kind dedicated? The catalogues of the Treasurers give the answer: in that chamber of the Parthenon which was called 'The Hecatompedos.' Out of the wealth of evidence I will select a few of the most pertinent illustrations. A list of 321-320 B.C. Ol. 114, 4 (*C.I.A.* ii. 719) records after 'the image (ἄγλυμα) in the Hecatompedos' the golden crowns 'proclaimed' (ἀναρνήντες sic) in the preceding year. The remains show that three of these crowns were given by the Athenian people (ὁ δῆμος ὁ 'Αθελίων) and it is possible that some of them were proclaimed at the great Panathenaea of 322-1, Ol. 114, 3. It is not difficult, however, to find a certain case of a crown proclaimed at this

<sup>1</sup> The use of ἐπειδὴ c. indic. in place of ἐπειδὴν c. subj. has a parallel in the decree of Tisamenus inserted in the MSS. of Andoc. 1. 83-4; for I agree with Dobree in thinking that in § 84 ἐπειδὴ ὁμομύκασιν ought to refer to the future. But in view of this passage it may be doubted whether he was right in substituting ἐπειδὴν ὁμομύκασιν.

festival and afterwards dedicated in the Parthenon. The Treasurers of 317-6, Ol. 115, 4, *i.e.* of the year following the great Panathenaea, added to the treasures of the temple στέφανος χρυσοῦς ὁ [ἀνακηρυχθεὶς Παναθηναίων τῶν με]γάλων τῷ γυμνικῷ [ἀγῶνι, ὃ ἐστεφάνωσεν ὁ δῆμος] ὁ Ἀθηναίων Κόνων[α] (ii. 728, A. ll. 18-23). The number of crowns so dedicated was sometimes considerable; in 345-4 B.C. the 'annual crowns' (στέφανοι ἐπέτειοι) were as many as nine (ii. 701, col. i. ll. 19-34); and ii. 698, col. i. contains a list of crowns received between 371-70 B.C. and 354-3 B.C. The mention of 'Athena' (not Athena Polias) in the formula of dedication appears in ii. 741, A. f. g. (see *addenda* p. 511), στέφανος ὃν Νεο[πτόλεμος Ἀ]ντικλέους Μελιτιάδης ἀνέθη[κεν τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ] στέφανοις ὑπ[ὸ τοῦ δήμου] τοῦ Ἀθηναίων.

That the style of decrees differed in no way from that of the Treasurers, may also be shown from ii. 163. Dr. Dörpfeld has already argued (*op. cit.* pp. 192-3) from this inscription that the principal cult of Athena on the Acropolis was that of Athena Polias. I only cite it to illustrate the conditions under which Athenian officials found it convenient to introduce the qualification Πολιάς. The monument is attributed to the period of Lycurgus' activity, and contains regulations for the better celebration of the annual or little Panathenaea. Observe the changes of expression in the following passage, ll. 17-24: βοωνήσαντες οἱ ἱεροποιοὶ μετὰ τῶν βοωνῶν πέμψαντες τὴν πομπὴν τῇ θεῇ θύοντων ταύτας τὰς βοὺς ἀπάσας ἐπὶ τῷ βωμῷ τῆς [Ἀθηνᾶς τῷ με]γάλῳ, μίαν δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ τῆς Νίκης προκρί[ναντες ἐκ τῶν] καλλιστενουσῶν βοῶν, καὶ θύσαντες τῇ [Ἀθηνᾷ τῇ] Πολιάδι καὶ τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ τῇ Νίκῃ ἀπασῶν τῶν βοῶν τῷ... ἐω[νημένων νεμ]όντων τὰ κρία τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίων. The restorations are certain, for the space can be calculated with exactness. Is it not plain (1) that Athena Polias is the same as 'Athena' and 'the goddess,' (2) that the juxtaposition of Athena Nike caused the addition of the epithet Polias? I have gone through all the passages from inscriptions and ancient writers concerning the Panathenaea, which are collected in the 2nd Appendix of Prof. Michaelis' book on the Parthenon, pp. 318-333. The usual description of the deity in honour of whom the festival was held is 'the goddess' or 'Athena'; the one or the other of these occurs thirty-six times. On the other hand, certain inscriptions excepted, all of which I have quoted and discussed in this paper, the word Polias is only used three times, in the following extracts: (1)

Zenob. 1. 56. Ἀκίσεως καὶ Ἐλικῶνος ἔργα ἐπὶ τῶν θαύματος ἀξίων οὔτοι γὰρ πρῶτοι τὸν τῆς πολιᾶδος Ἀθηνᾶς πέπλον ἐδημιούργησαν. (2) Aristoph. *Birds* 826 sqq. Ἐπ. λιπαρὸν τὸ χρῆμα τῆς πόλεως. τίς δαὶ θεὸς | πολιοῦχος ἔσται; τῷ ξανοῦμεν τὸν πέπλον; Πε' τί δ' οὐκ Ἀθηναίαν ἑώμεν πολιᾶδα; (3) Schol. R. ad loc. τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ πολιᾶδι οὕτῃ πέπλος ἐγένετο παμπούκιλος, ὃν ἀνέφερον ἐν τῇ πομπῇ τῶν Παναθηναίων. (I have excluded Hdt. 5. 82, because the passage has nothing to do with the Panathenaea.)

The inscriptions already examined seem sufficient to prove that it is an error to tie down the word Polias to a distinct local sense, confined to one place, viz. the Erechtheum. But to complete the inquiry something must be said concerning the formulae which are found in dedications. The title Athena Polias occurs occasionally in lists of treasures, not because the Treasurers inserted it to prevent confusion, but because the longer and unambiguous style had been used by the dedicators and was quoted in the catalogue. Part of the inventory of the 'old temple' (ἀρχαῖος νεὸς) is preserved in ii. 733 and 735, and ll. 17-22 of the latter inscription have been restored as follows: [φιάλη ἀργυρὰ ἐφ'] εἰ ἐπιγέγραπ[τα] Ἀθηνᾷ Πολι[αδὶ Φρονισκο]ς.....ἀνέθ[ηκε] ἑτέρα φιά[λη] ἀργυρὰ, ἐφ' εἰ ἐπιγέγραπται [ἱερὰ Ἀθηνᾶς Πολι[αδὸς] ἀνέθηκε.....σ]τράτη. Similarly in ii. 724 B. 9-17, 737 A. ii. 9 (where Koehler's supplement Πολιάδι seems to me right) and 649, 14-5 (Ἀθην[α]ί[ο]ς [εἰ] ἀνέθεσαν Πολιάδι, though ἀνέθεσαν here is suspicious; note l. 7 Ἀθηναῖοι Ἀθην[α]ία ἀκροβ[ο]λινον) the word Polias was part of the inscription graven on the offering. Excavations on the Acropolis have brought to light very ancient examples of the fuller form of dedication *e.g.* iv. 2, 373<sup>106</sup> (p. 91) [Ἀστῶν?] θαλόντων πολιοῦχε πότνι Ἀθάνια Σμίκρο καὶ παῖδον μνῆ' ἔχοι ἔδε πόλις, and iv. 3, 373<sup>81</sup> (p. 180) Δε[ῖ]κατεν : Ἀθηναία : πολιοῦχοι [Ἰ]εροκλείδες : μ' ἀνέθεκεν : Γλανκίο. The second of these inscriptions is particularly noteworthy, because in seeking to explain the wealth of 'the goddess' or 'Athena' in the 5th century, historians always reckon the tithes of various kinds paid to her; see the references in Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* iii. 1, p. 215, n. 2. The motives that led any particular dedicator to write Athena Polias or Poliouchos rather than Athena, are beyond speculation. It is enough to observe that it was easy to tag a verse with Ἀθηναία πολιοῦχε, and that offerings were made on the Acropolis, not only to the guardian goddess, but to Athena Nike, to Athena

Ergane (iv. 3, 373<sup>271</sup> [p. 205]), and to Athena Hygieia (i. 335).

The result of this investigation, that the goddess of the Parthenon had a right to the title Polias, has a bearing on two topographical controversies, the one about Athena's temples on the Acropolis, the other concerning the nature and site of the Opisthodomus. I hold, agreeing partially with Dr. Dörpfeld, that a third century decree (ii. 332, 44) contains the complete and unambiguous official description of the Parthenon, viz. 'the temple of Athena Polias on the Acropolis'; there was a temple of Athena Nike on the Acropolis. I also think that the Parthenon was sometimes meant by 'the temple,' as in the decree in honour of Spartocus and Pairisades (iv., ii. 109 b) and in an inventory of 'the Treasurers of Athena and the other gods' which probably was made in 390-89 B.C. (ii. 660, 49), but only when the context removed obscurity. But Dr. Dörpfeld's theory about the meaning of 'the old temple' I cannot accept, finding nothing in the inscriptions in favour of his view that 'the old temple of Athena on the Acropolis' in a decree supposed to be earlier than 460 B.C. (iv. 1. c. 28-9; the supplement ἀρχαίο seems right) or 'the old temple of Athena Polias' in a decree of the first century B.C. (ii. 464, 6; I accept the supplement) or 'the old temple' mentioned in a fourth century inventory of the treasures of Athena (ii. 733, A. col. ii. 6; in ii. 650, 2 (cp. 675, 2) and in ii. 163, 10-11 the supplements are not to be trusted) was distinct from the Erechtheum or an earlier temple on the site of the Erechtheum. The fragment of a fifth century decree preserved in i. 93 is best set aside, because owing to the mutilation of the stone, it cannot be settled whether the phrase in a l. 6 was 'the old temple' simply or 'the old temple of Athena' or 'the old temple of Athena Polias.' Further, whenever the words 'the old temple' are found in inventories of the Treasurers of the other gods (ii. 672, 43; cf. iv., ii. 672 c. 6) or of the superintendents (ἐπιστάται) of the Brauronium (ii. 751 B. col. ii. frg. d. 19, ii. 758, col. ii. 7) it is prudent to suspend judgment; our knowledge of the history of the various temples in Attica is not exhaustive.

The hypothesis that in inscriptions 'the temple of Athena Polias' means the Parthenon and 'the old temple of Athena Polias' the Erechtheum or an earlier temple on the site of the Erechtheum, has the merit of simplicity and is not contradicted by any of the few scattered facts at present

known. But the language of literature must be distinguished from the language of the monuments and measured by other canons. In inscriptions of the fifth and fourth centuries the word Parthenon denotes a chamber in the 'great temple,' but the use of the name to designate the whole building was familiar in the age of Demosthenes, and could not fail to influence the popular nomenclature of Athena's temples on the Acropolis. Men who were in the habit of speaking, just as we do, of the Parthenon, might without serious ambiguity call the Erechtheum 'the temple of the Polias'; nothing was more natural, for the Erechtheum was indubitably the seat of the most ancient worship of the tutelary goddess. But the usage of literature has not the fixity and regularity of official tradition; the Erechtheum is sometimes styled 'the old temple of the Polias,' as by Strabo (ix. 16, p. 396), while Aristides (i. p. 548, 14 Dind.) refers to the Parthenon under the title of 'the temple of Athena.' When the authority is not epigraphical but literary, no argument can be based on the meaning of the phrase 'the temple of the Polias,' if the context is lost or deprived of value by our ignorance of facts obvious to the writer. In my opinion the passages where this expression causes serious perplexity, are not numerous, but some there are, particularly in lexica and collections of scholia.

One of these ambiguous extracts has been used recently in a discussion of the site of the Opisthodomus. Prof. White, believing with Dr. Milchhoefer (*Philologus* N.F. 7. 1894, p. 352 sqq.) and other distinguished scholars that the Opisthodomus was not part of the Parthenon but a separate building complete in itself, seeks (*op. cit.*) to fix its position from a scholion on Aristoph. *Plut.* 1193 τὸν ὀπισθόδομον ἀεὶ φυλάττων τῆς θεοῦ. On this verse the *Venetus* (V) has the following note, which I give as corrected by J. Meursius: ὀπίσω τοῦ νεῦ τῆς καλουμένης πολιᾶδος Ἀθηνᾶς διπλοῦς τοίχος (οἶκος Michaelis and Prof. White) ἔχων θύραν, ὅπου ἦν θησαυροφυλάκιον. Prof. White starts from the doctrine that 'the temple of the Polias' must mean under all circumstances the Erechtheum. He therefore takes the scholion as proof that the Opisthodomus was 'behind the Erechtheum.' But what was considered the front of this temple? The northern or the eastern portico? He thinks it 'probable that at least in the time of the sources from which the scholiast and Harpocration and other lexicographers drew their information the front of the temple

was thought to be at the north' (*op. cit.* p. 39). The Opisthodomus, then, was to the south of the Erechtheum. Further, it is suggested on the strength of Hdt. 8, 55 that a Greek felt the Pandroseum to be part of the Erechtheum; and in the end the Opisthodomus is discovered to the south, not of the temple buildings, but of the precinct called the Pandroseum, on the site of the three western rooms and western portico of the old Hecatompedon. The theory is that these chambers which made up the Opisthodomus or 'back part' of the 'ante-Persian' temple of Athena, were rebuilt, after the devastation of the Acropolis by Xerxes' army, to serve as a treasury of the gods and of the state, that they retained their old name, although the rest of the building was not restored, and that they constitute 'the Opisthodomus' of literature and inscriptions. Now, if it had been convincingly demonstrated that the western portion of the 'ante-Persian' temple of Athena was rebuilt between the years 479 B.C. and 435-4 B.C., in order that Athens might not be without a treasury, it might be permissible to conclude that by the words

'behind the temple of Athena called Polias' the original author of the obscure definition reproduced in V must have meant 'to the south of the Pandroseum,' where *ex hypothesi* a structure stood that might perhaps have been called 'the Opisthodomus.' But it is precisely the existence of such a building that stands in need of proof. The restoration, partial or complete, of the old Hecatompedon destroyed by the Persians is merely a conjecture, not an unquestionable fact certified by ancient authorities and architectural remains. When the position of the Opisthodomus is discovered, it will be possible to interpret the statement of Harpocration, Photius, Suidas, and Schol. R on Aristoph. *Plut.* 1193 that it was 'behind the temple of Athena' and estimate the value of the unique note in the *Venetus*, on which Prof. White builds. But in this matter the lexica and scholia are worthless, since every critic can construe them in accordance with his own prepossessions. My bias, I will confess, inclines me towards the Parthenon.

W. WYSE.

#### NOTES ON BACCHYLIDES.

(Continued from p. 133.)

XVII. 95-99. I wish to amend one detail in my note on this passage (*C.R.* xii. p. 129). In 97 I proposed to read *οὐρία νότον δ' ἐκόντες ἔξεσαν* (the last word being due to Mr. F. W. Thomas). But the Facsimile (col. 26) convinces me that what was read as *EKON* is *EKOAI*, the last stroke being doubtless part of *Π*, so that Prof. Blass is right in giving *ἐκόλπωσαν*. To this, however, he subjoins *σὺν αὔραις*, where the metre indicates only ~ - (cp. 31, 64, 130, 196). Read *οὐρία νότον δ' ἐκόλπωσαν πνοῇ* | *ἰστίον κ.τ.λ.*: cp. *Anth.* 9. 363 *πνοῇ ἀπηγάντῳ Ζεφύρου λῖνα κολπώσαντες*.

XVII. 7. *Π. ΑΕΜΑΙΓΙΔΟΣ ΑΘΑΝΑΣ. πολεμαίγιδος* (Kenyon) is, I think, right: 'with warlike aegis.' For analogous compounds of *πόλεμος* cp. *Batrachom.* 475 *Παλλάδα πέμψωμεν πολεμόκλονον*: anon. ap. Dionys. *De comp.* 17 *Βρόμει ..πολεμοκέλαδε*: schol. *Od.* 1. 48 *πολεμόφρων*. Prof. Housman and Mr. W. Headlam propose *οσελμαίγιδος* ('aegis-shaking'), an ingenious conjecture, which Mr. Headlam illustrates

by *Il.* 4. 167 (*Ζεὺς αὐτὸς ἐπισσείησιν ἱερμὴν αἰγίδα πᾶσιν*: where the 'dark aegis' that Zeus 'brandishes over' the Trojans directly suggests the storm-cloud. But the aegis worn by Athena as part of her panoply was regularly depicted as a short cape or mantle. She can, indeed, spread this to the wind as a sail (*ῥοιβδοῦσα κόλπον αἰγίδος*, Aesch. *Eum.* 404); but she could not well be described as 'shaking' it like a shield. As to the form *πελεμαίγης*, Mr. Headlam remarks that (despite such exceptions as *τερπικέρανος*) we might rather expect *πελεμξαίγης*. No other compound with *πελεμ-* or *πελεμξ-* occurs. Athena, it may be noted, is here the sender of Boreas; and it might be argued, in favour of *πελεμαίγιδος*, that here, as in the *Iliad* l.c., there is a reference to the storm-cloud. Even if (as seems probable) the poet wrote *πολεμαίγιδος*, that association with *αἰγίς* may, indeed, have been present to his mind. But that he should have conceived Athena (like the Homeric Zeus) as 'shaking' the storm-aegis is most unlikely, when we remember that her cape-aegis was already



a fixed convention of contemporary Greek art. Thus on that very cylix of Euphronius (*circ.* 490–450 B.C.) which illustrates one scene of this poem—the reception of Theseus by Amphitrite—Athena, the hero's guardian goddess, is wearing the cape-aegis (Baumeister, p. 1793).

XVII. 20. εἶπεν occurs again in 74. If sound, it may be explained by a wish to vary εἶπεν, which occurs in 47, 52, and 81. Prof. v. Wilamowitz assumes (as I did at first) that εἶπεν is merely a corruption of εἴπεν, due to a form of Pi (with the right-hand stroke shorter than the other) which went out of general use after the second century B.C. Hence he regards the (supposed) corruption as one of the documents for the antiquity of the source from which our MS. comes. But the change of such a Pi into P is not a very probable one. And it would be a most singular coincidence which had preserved εἴπεν in 47, 52 and 81, but corrupted it in 74 to εἶπεν,—just in the place where the poet might naturally have wished to break the monotony. For εἶπεν, indeed, he had no warrant (known to us) except the rare present εἴπω (*Od.* 11. 137 and 13. 7); but he may have thought that sufficient.

## XVII. 36–38.

χρυσέον  
τέ οἱ δόσαν ἰόπλοκοι  
κάλυμμα Νηρηίδες.

A short syllable is wanting after ἰόπλοκοι. I agree with those who hold that τοι will not serve; and as to another possibility, κάλυμμ' — Νηρηίδες, I can think of no tolerable word to fill the gap. Now, Theseus is here insisting with pride on his parentage;—Aethra became the bride of Poseidon,—aye, and the Nereids gave her a golden veil.' ἰόπλοκοί γε seems, then, possible.

## XVII. 74–76.

Θησεύ, <σὺ> τάδε  
μὲν βλέπεις σαφῆ Διὸς  
δῶρα· σὺ δ' ὄρνυ' κ.τ.λ.

After Θησεύ, the MS. has lost a short syllable (cp. 8, 31, 97): and σὺ might easily have dropped out after -σεύ. Is σὺ δ' ὄρνυ' in 76 conclusive against this view? I think not; because σὺ δὲ with *imperative* was an idiom (especially Ionic) in which the stress on the verb was much stronger than that on the pronoun; see e.g. *Her.* 3. 68 εἰ μὴ αὐτῇ Σμέρδιν . . γινώσκεις, σὺ δὲ παρὰ Ἀτόσσης πύθεν: *id.* 7. 159 εἰ δ' ἄρα μὴ δικάϊους ἄρχεσθαι, σὺ δὲ μηδὲ βοήθεε: cp. *Il.* 9. 300 ff., 6.

46, etc. Hence σὺ δ' ὄρνυ', with the chief emphasis on the imperative, is quite compatible with σὺ τάδε μὲν βλέπεις two lines before, where the emphasis on σὺ is normal.

Prof. Platt's τὰδ' ἐμὰ is a plausible conjecture (though he need not have altered Θησεύ into Θησεί). But this papyrus never had any letters after ΤΑΔΕ in v. 74 (Facsimile, col. 34). We should have to assume, then, that the letters ΜΑ (required to complete τὰδ' ἐμὰ) either were accidentally omitted by the scribe, or were absent from the MS. which he copied.

## XVII. 86.

τα . εν δὲ Διὸς νιὸς ἐνδοθεν  
κῆαρ, κέλευσέ τε κατ' οὐ-  
[ρ]ον ἴσχειν εὐδαίδαλον  
νᾶα· Μοῖρα δ' ἑτέραν ἐπόρσυν' ὀδόν.

The first word is read by Mr. Kenyon as τᾶ(ξ)εν, and by Prof. Blass as τᾶ(κ)εν. I hold that it was γᾶ(θ)εν. Mr. Kenyon would, indeed, have placed this in the text, had it not involved the alteration of a letter in the mutilated word: few changes, however, are slighter than that of T to Γ. What would τᾶξεν (or τᾶκεν) κῆαρ mean? The disguised Odysseus says to Penelope, *μηκέτι νῦν χρῶα καλὸν ἐναίρεο μηδ' ἔτι θυμὸν | τῆκε πόσιν γοάουσα*, 'nor waste thy heart with weeping for thy lord.' So the sense here would be, 'Minos wasted his heart within him,'—was consumed with *grief*,—which cannot be meant; or possibly (though this would strain the phrase), 'felt his heart melt within him' from *amazement* or *fear*. (So Kenyon: 'Minos was taken aback and scared.') But the whole context makes it clear that the sense required is, 'Minos secretly rejoiced.' It was with a malignant intent, as the poet hints, that he had challenged Theseus to ask a sign from Poseidon:—ἔφαψε . . ποταμίαν μῆτιν (v. 51). Theseus sprang from the deck into the sea,—and no sign of the sea-god's favour was yet visible to the spectators. Minos was delighted. He thought that he had got rid of his foe. Instead of stopping the ship, he told his pilot to keep her on her way before the wind (κατ' οὐρον ἴσχειν): 'but Fate,' adds the poet, 'was preparing a different course,'—viz., other than that in which Minos was prematurely rejoicing,—another confirmation of γᾶθεν. Then the feeling of Minos is contrasted with the terror and grief of the ἧθροι (92 ff.). Lastly, when Theseus reappears from the depths, the poet exclaims (v. 119), φεύ, οἴαισιν ἐν φροντίσι Κνώσσιον ἔσχασεν στραταγέταν,—'in what thoughts did he check' Minos,—by abruptly

dispelling his sense of triumph and security. In view of all this, it seems pretty certain that B. did not write  $\tau\acute{\alpha}(\xi)\epsilon\nu$  or  $\tau\acute{\alpha}(\kappa)\epsilon\nu$ : and, for my own part, I have little doubt that the word was  $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\nu$ .

In C.R. xii. p. 139 Prof. Housman argues in favour of  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\epsilon\nu$  (or  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon\nu$ ) as against  $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\nu$ : I wish to examine his argument. Disregarding the accent on  $\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$  in the MS. v. 87 f., he writes  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ , and explains the passage as follows. When Theseus, accepting the challenge of Minos, jumped overboard, 'Minos was filled with remorse, as befitted a son of Zeus, to think that he had sent a fine young fellow to his death.' So he ordered the crew to stop the ship, which was running before the wind ( $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$   $\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon\nu$  . .  $\nu\acute{\alpha}\alpha$ ). 'But fate ordained a different course.' And what was this 'different course'? Simply, according to Mr. Housman, *that the ship should sail on*. But, if Minos told his men to stop the ship, why did they not do so? Did fate inspire a mutiny on board? Or, if the  $\kappa\upsilon\beta\epsilon\rho\eta\gamma\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$  obeyed Minos, and put his helm hard up, did fate forbid the ship to answer it? In either case, the operation of fate was of so remarkable a kind that one might have expected the poet to say more about it. Then this sudden tenderness of Minos, though in itself an engaging trait, is surprisingly inconsistent with the rest of his conduct in this Minotaur business; if he really stopped to pick up Theseus, his true motive (one might suspect) was consideration for the hungry Minotaur. Lastly, as to the change of  $\kappa\alpha\tau'$   $\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$  into  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$  (a word which nowhere occurs, but for which Mr. Housman compares  $\epsilon\pi\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ ): he assumes that  $\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon\nu$   $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$   $\nu\acute{\alpha}\alpha$  means  $\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon\nu$   $\tau\eta\nu$   $\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\rho\iota\zeta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$   $\nu\acute{\alpha}\nu$ , 'to stop the ship which was (then) running before the wind'; but, according to the ordinary idiom of classical Greek, the sense should be rather, 'to keep the ship before the wind,'  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$  being still equivalent to  $\kappa\alpha\tau'$   $\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ . In support of the MS.  $\kappa\alpha\tau'$   $\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$   $\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon\nu$  as 'to keep before the wind,' it may be noted that the phrase  $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\nu$   $\nu\acute{\alpha}\nu$  often occurs with reference to keeping a ship on a certain course: e.g. *Od.* 10. 91  $\epsilon\nu\theta'$   $\omicron\iota$   $\gamma'$   $\epsilon\iota\omega$   $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$   $\epsilon\chi\omicron\nu$   $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma$ , ('thereinto they all steered their ships'); *Her.* 6. 95  $\omicron\upsilon$   $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$   $\tau\eta\nu$   $\eta\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\nu$   $\epsilon\iota\chi\omicron\nu$   $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$   $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma$   $\kappa.\tau.\lambda.$

XVII. 95.  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\iota\acute{\omicron}\nu$  . . .  $\delta\mu\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ . What is the meaning of the epithet? Suidas has  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\varsigma$  (which, by the way, is not in L. and S.),  $\delta$   $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\eta\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$   $\epsilon\chi\omicron\nu$   $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$   $\delta\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ . This ought probably to be  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho(\iota)\acute{\omicron}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\varsigma$ . The form  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  is, indeed, given by Hesych.

( $\delta$   $\iota\sigma\chi\eta\delta\varsigma$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\delta\phi\theta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ ), and occurs (see L. and S.) in *C. I.* 6270a,  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\tau\iota\epsilon$ . . .  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\alpha}$   $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ , a reminiscence of the cicada's  $\delta\pi\alpha$   $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\epsilon\iota\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$  in *Il.* 3. 152. But  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  was presumably a rarer form than  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ . The interpretation of  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\varsigma$  as denoting  $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\eta\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$   $\delta\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  seems to be derived from that of  $\delta\pi\alpha$   $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\epsilon\iota\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$  as  $\tau\eta\nu$   $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\eta\gamma\eta$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\eta\delta\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$  (Hesych.), a 'soothing' or 'pleasing' voice. This explanation of  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  in that phrase is generalised in the gloss of Suidas,  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha$   $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ ,  $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\eta\gamma\eta$ ,  $\tau\epsilon\rho\pi\nu\acute{\alpha}$ ,  $\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$ . It is unfortunate, that we know nothing as to the age or source of  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\varsigma$ : we can only say that it has the stamp of a late word. But it is quite intelligible that the old epic  $\delta\pi\alpha$   $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\epsilon\iota\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$  (varied in later epos to  $\delta\pi\alpha$   $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\iota\omicron\nu$ ) should have been taken to mean, (1) a voice of delicate charm—the image being borrowed from the delicate beauty of the lily; cp.  $\chi\rho\acute{\omicron}\alpha$   $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha$ , 'delicate skin,' in *Il.* 13. 830: and then, by an easy transition, (2) 'a gentle or soothing voice,'— $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\eta\gamma\eta$ ,—which would well suit (e.g.) the  $\delta\pi\alpha$   $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\iota\omicron\nu$  of the Sirens (*Ap. Rhod.* 4. 903). Next would come secondary phrases of a more artificial cast, such as  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\alpha}$   $\delta\mu\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$  in the sense of *blandi oculi*, 'gentle' eyes. Is such a phrase too artificial,—too Alexandrian,—for a poet living in the first half of the fifth century B.C.? My own instinct would be rather to answer that question in the affirmative. But it remains a possibility that Bacchylides may have intended such a sense. The only alternative that I can see is to understand, 'eyes of delicate beauty.' When Pindar calls the white coral  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\iota\omicron\nu$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu$   $\pi\omicron\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$  . . .  $\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  (*N.* 7. 79) that notion is present; there, however, the notion of colour also comes in.

#### XVII. 123-129.

$\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu$ -  
 $\pi\epsilon$   $\delta'$   $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\iota$   $\gamma\iota\upsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma$   $\theta\epsilon\omega\nu$   $\delta\omega\rho'$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\lambda\alpha\acute{\omicron}$ -  
 $\theta\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\iota$   $\tau\epsilon$   $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\iota$   $\sigma\acute{\omicron}\nu$   $\epsilon\upsilon$ -  
 $\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha$   $\nu\epsilon\omicron\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\tau\omega$   
 $\acute{\omega}\lambda\acute{\omicron}\lambda\upsilon\zeta\alpha\nu$   $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\alpha\gamma\epsilon\nu$   $\delta\epsilon$   
 $\pi\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$   $\eta\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota$   $\delta'$   $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu$   
 $\nu\epsilon\omicron\iota$   $\pi\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\zeta\alpha\nu$   $\epsilon\rho\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}$   $\delta\pi\acute{\iota}$ .

Who are the  $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\iota$  in v. 125?  $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\lambda\alpha\acute{\omicron}$ - $\theta\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$  is an epithet of the Muses in Pind. *O.* 13. 96; and of the Danaides in *N.* 10. 1 (with reference to their representation in sculpture). So  $\epsilon\upsilon\theta\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$  is said by Pindar of Aphrodite, the Horae, the daughters of Cadmus, and Clio. The epithet  $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\lambda\alpha\acute{\omicron}\theta\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\iota$  strongly suggests, then, that the  $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\iota$  meant are divine (or semi-divine) persons; and these can here be only the Nereids. Cp.

Pind. *N.* 4, 65 ὑψιθρόνων μίαν Νηρηίδων. In Eur. *I.A.* 239 ff. golden statues of Nereids are at the sterns of the ships of Achilles. Theseus found the Nereids in the halls of Amphitrite (v. 101 ff.). If the epithet be pressed, they must be imagined as still seated there; their cry of joy, mingled with the sound of the sea (ἐκλαγεν), is heard from the depths: they rejoice in the honours shown to the son of Poseidon. But ἀγλαόθρονοι might also be taken as merely an *epitheton ornans*; just as the palace of Poseidon beneath the waves is called that of πατρός ἱππίου (v. 99 f.). The phrase σὺν εὐθυμῇ νεοκίτῳ might naturally suggest that the κοῦραι are the seven Athenian maidens on board the ship: but ἀγλαόθρονοι must then refer merely to their seats on the ἔκρια at the stern (as in Eur. *Helen.* 1571 Helen sits ἐν μέσους ἰδωλούς): and considering their plight as victims destined for the Minotaur, the epithet would be strange indeed. Further, the term ἦθροι in 128 would naturally denote both the maidens and the youths, as it does in v. 43 and 93, and as κοῦρους also does in v. 3. [Since writing this, I learn that M. Henri Weil also understands the Nereids to be meant.]

XVII. 131 φρένα ἰανθείς. The hiatus is irregular, since ἰάνω had no *f*. My suggestion φρένας is accepted by Prof. v. Wilamowitz (*Gött. Anz.* p. 138). If φρένα be right, we can only compare v. 74 f., ἐξελετο ἰόν (ἰός, ἄρρου, not having *f*).

XVIII. 10. σεύοντ' = σεύοντι. For the elision of *i* in the Doric 3rd pl., cp. Pind. *P.* 4. 241 ἀγαπάζοντ'. αὐτίκα κ.τ.λ.

XVIII. 35. ἡ μῶνον σὺν ὅπλοις MS. Verses 5, 20, and 50 show the metre — — — — —. We need not change μῶνον to μόνον here, nor κῆνυκτον to κῆνυκτον in 50. Kenyon gives ἡ μόνον τ' ἀνοπλὸν τέ νιν. On this view the σὺν ὅπλοις of the MS. would be a dittographia from σὺν πολεμίοις ὅπλοις in 33 f. Prof. Housman proposes ἡ μῶνον συνοπαίων (cp. Soph. *O.C.* 1250 ἀνδρῶν γε μῶνος); the corruption would then have started from a change of ΠΑ into ΠΛ, coupled perhaps with some mutilation or blurring of ΝΩ. An emendation which requires less change is ἡ μῶνον συνοπλοῖό νιν: if the last *O* had become *C*, the first *N* of νιν would have been deleted. This is due to A. Ludwich (Königsberg programm, 1898, p. 13), who compares At. 511 σοῦ διόισεται μόνος. Against the distinct gain in palaeographical probability we have, however, to weigh the fact that, for a contrast with στρατιῶν

ἀγοντα πολλάν in 34, a plural like συνοπαίων is slightly better than the singular συνοπλοῖο.

## XVIII. 50–54.

κῆνυκτον κύνεαν Λάκαι-  
ναν κρατὸς ὑπὲρ πυρσοχαιτου,  
χιτῶνα πορφύρεον  
στέρνοις τ' ἄμφι καὶ οὐλιον  
Θεσσαλῶν χλαμύδ'· κ.τ.λ.

As to the last three of these verses, the obvious remedy has been proposed by Prof. v. Wilamowitz, and (independently) by Prof. Platt: we must write στέρνοις τε πορφύρεον | χιτῶν' ἄμφι. The problem of v. 51 remains, where the — — — given by (κρατὸς) ὑπὲρ ought to be — — —, as is indicated by vv. 6, 21, 36. Prof. Crusius, indeed, holds (*Philol.* lvii. p. 175) that 'Ionics with anacalasis' form a characteristic element in the logaedic style of this poem, and that anacalasis explains the metrical divergence between v. 51 and the triad of corresponding verses: but I cannot persuade myself of this. Mr. W. Headlam (*C.R.* xii. 67) says, 'Possibly κρατὸς κάτω,' comparing *Od.* 8. 84 f. φᾶρος . . | καὶ κεφαλῆς εἵρυσσε ('drew his cloak down over his head'): but this emendation would 'bonnet' Theseus. Prof. Housman (*ib.* p. 74) says: 'Write κρατὸς θ' ὑπο in 51 and delete τ' in 53.' But what sense results? 'He had a helmet . . , and beneath his head a purple tunic', etc. Surely the simplest remedy is here the most probable, viz., to write κρατὸς περὶ πυρσοχαιτου. Mr. Kenyon objects that we should expect the dative (as in 47 f. περὶ παιδίοις δ' ὁμοῖς | εἴφος ἔχειν): and it is quite true that the dative would be normal. But the genitive also occurs, though rarely, with περὶ in the local sense: see *Od.* 5. 68 ἡ δ' αὐτοῦ τετάνυστο περὶ σπείους γλαφυροῖο | ἡμερίς, 'about the hollow cave trailed a garden-vine.' Again, in *Od.* 5. 130 περὶ τρόπιος βεβαῶτα ('bestriding the keel') is exactly parallel with ἄμφ' ἐνὶ δούρατι βαῖνε *ib.* 371: but we know that ἄμφι κεφαλῇ (in a local sense) was good Greek (*Il.* 18. 205). Is there, then, any reason to doubt that, under even a light pressure of metrical convenience, a Greek poet could have used περὶ κρατὸς in a local sense?

## XIX. 12–16.

πρέπει σε φερτάταν ἱμεν  
ὀδὸν παρὰ Καλλιόπας λα-  
χοῖσαν ἐξοχον γέρας·  
†τιμῇ† Ἄργος ὅθ' ἵππιον λιποῦσα  
φέγγε χρυσέα βοῦς κ.τ.λ.

τιμῇ in 15, i.e. τί ἦν, has found two dis-

tinguished defenders—Prof. v. Wilamowitz ('Was war . . . als Io . . .?'), and Prof. Crusius, who regards it as an old formula in beginning a story. (Both critics hold the iambus to be admissible.) But I agree with those who think *την* corrupt. Mr. Marindin proposes to read *τίεν* (Doric inf.), and to omit the point after *γέρας*, so that the construction is, *λαχοῖσαν ἔξοχον γέρας τίεν*, *quae rem eximiam celebrandam acceperis*: cp. Aesch. *Ag.* 705 f. *τὸ νυμφότιμον | μέλος ἐκφάτως τίοντας*. The point after *γέρας* in the MS. is not conclusive against this attractively simple correction; for such a point would naturally have been added when *TIEN* came to be read as *TIHN* (τί *ἦν*). The connection, however, of *Ἄργος δ' ἵππιον κ.τ.λ.* with the preceding context seems then not quite satisfactory. We have to take the sentence *ὅτ' Ἄργος φεύγε βούς* as defining either *ὁδόν*, the strain of song, or (which would be more natural) *γέρας*, the choice theme: '(namely the time) when Io was fleeing,' etc. This is not (I think) at all impossible; but it is somewhat strange. I am much disposed to accept a conjecture of Mr. W. Headlam (*C.R.* xii. p. 68), which allows us to keep the MS. stop after *γέρας*: viz. *ἦεν*, 'There was a time when,' etc. Mr. Headlam has cited several passages for the usage of *ἦν ὅτε*. He has omitted, however, to observe that this usage exhibits two distinct shades of meaning. (1) *Anthol.* l. 92 begins with *ἦν ὅτε Χριστὸς ἔγενε κ.τ.λ.* This is exactly apposite: for *ἦν ὅτε* is there merely a formula prefacing a narrative; 'There was a time when' (= 'Once upon a time'). (2) In all the other passages it will be found that *ἦν ὅτε* introduces a contrast between past and present; e.g., *Anth.* 8. 178 *ἦν ὅτε ἦν ἀνίκατος . . . νῦν δέ με θῆρ ἐτίναξεν*: 'there was a time when I was unshaken,'—but now it is otherwise. So also *Anth.* 12. 44; 14. 52; 9. 344 (*ἦν ὁπότε*): in Pind. fr. 83 (B<sup>4</sup>) we have only the words *ἦν ὅτε σῖας τὸ Βοιωτίων ἔθνος ἔρεπον*,—but that was manifestly an instance of the same kind. Presumably, then, this antithetic use of *ἦν ὅτε* was the normal one. But the single example (*Anth.* l. 92) quoted above suffices to show that the purely prefatory use was idiomatic. As to the form *ἦεν*, it occurs *Il.* 12. 9, Hes. *Scut.* 15: an Ionic poet could certainly use it. Palaeographically, too, the correction is tenable. *TIHN* would come from *HEN* through *H* being read as *TI* (as Mr. Kenyon says, 'TI is very like H in the MS.'): and *EN* would then be read as *HN*.

XVIII. 29 *εἴτ' οὖν*...33 *ἦ ῥα*...35 *ἦ Πιερίδες*...37 *ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν*.

In 33 we must certainly (I think) read *ἦ ῥα*. In 29, where I accepted Mr. Kenyon's reading of *ΕΙΤΟΥΝ* as *εἴτ' οὖν*, I now prefer my earlier view, that it should be read as *εἴτ' οὖν*. The whole context from 29 to 37 is then as follows:—'Now whether fate decreed that Hermes should (unaided) slay Argus, or [ἦ in 33] whether the ceaseless cares of Argus finally exhausted him, or [ἦ in 35] the Muses lulled him to sleep,—for me at any rate [*ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν* in 37] it is safest (to relate only what is certain—or the final issue—viz., the arrival of Io in Egypt, and the birth of Epaphus).' The defective verse 38, *ἀσφαλείστατον ἄπε*, is thus completed by v. Wilamowitz, *ἄπερ ἐκράνθη λέγειν* (i.e., 'to tell how matters were finally ordained'). [Seeking to preserve the sequence *ἀπ*, without inserting the conjectural iota which *ἄπερ* requires, I suggested *ἄπερ εἰλικρινῇ λέγειν*: but it has been rightly objected that the adj. is a prose word. I took *-ον ἄπερ* to be --- for *-ν*. *ἄπερ ἐμφανῇ λέγειν* would be possible.]

#### XVIII. 39–45.

*ἐπεὶ παρ' ἀνθεμῶ[δεα  
40 Νείλον ἀφίκετ'  
Ἴω φέρονσα παῖδ'  
Ἐπαφον, ἐνθα ν[  
αἰνόστολων πρ[  
ἵπερόχῳ βρύνοντ'  
45 μεγίσταν τε θν[*

Much turns on the word in 43 which the *ed. princeps* gives as *αἰνόστολον*. The first letter seems, however, to be A rather than Λ (Facsimile col. 39), thus giving *λινοστόλων*, which is read by Prof. v. Wilamowitz and by Prof. Blass. The epithet would be specially suitable to Egyptian priests; but might also be said of the Egyptians generally (Her. 2. 37 *εἰματα δὲ λίνεα φορέουσι αἰεὶ νεόπλιντα*). In an Egyptian Isis-hymn of circ. 350 A.D. (Kaibel *Épigr. Gr.* 1028) Isis is addressed as *Αἰγύπτου βασίλεια λινόστολε*.

But did *νν* in 42 refer to Io or to Epaphus? If to Io, then *βρύνοντ'* in 44 must have been either *βρύνοντος* or *βρύνωντων*. For *βρύνοντος* (ὄλβω, or the like), we should need a subst. in the sense of *γένεος*: but this is not easy to fit in along with *λινοστόλων*. If the word was *βρύνωντων*, then it must (for metrical reasons) have been the last of the verse (so that a subst. for *ἵπερόχῳ* would have to be found in 42 or 43): and it would be an epithet of the *λινοστόλων* (the Egyptian priests or people); whereas the lauda-



tory epithet should belong rather to Epaphus or his royal descendants. Therefore it seems probable that *νιν* in 42 referred, not to Io, but to Epaphus.

If *Λινωστόλων* was an epithet of the priests, we might restore (*exempli gratia*) thus:—

- 41 Ἴω φέρουσα παῖδ' [ὑπερτάτου Διὸς]  
Ἐπαφὸν ἔνθα ν[ιν] ἱερέων ἔθηκεν]  
Λινωστόλων πρύ[τανιν]  
ὑπερόχῳ βρύοντ[α] πλούτῳ],  
45 μεγίσταν τε θν[ατῶν κτίσε σποράν].

For *ἱερέων* (---), cp. II. 2 *ἱεράν* (---). The subject to *ἔθηκεν* and *κτίσε* would be Ζεύς, supplied from Διὸς in 41. If *Λινωστόλων* referred to the Egyptians at large, we might suggest in 42 (with a different but equally possible rhythm),

\*Ἐπαφὸν ἔνθα νιν ἔσσε δαμοτῶν.

#### XVIII. 46-48.

ὄθεν καὶ ἄγανορ[ε]  
ἐν ἑπταπύλοισι Θήβαις]  
Κάδμος Σεμέ[λαν φύενσεν].

Led by *ἄγανορ* in the first transcript, I conjectured *ἄγανόρειος*. The Facsimile shows after *ΑΓΑΝΟΡ* a small vestige of the top of a letter which might be I quite as well as E. And since I is admissible, it is obvious that we should read *Ἀγανοριδᾶς* (as Crusius, v. Wilamowitz, and Blass agree in doing). Agenor, father of Cadmus, was grandson of Epaphus.

XX. Idas and Lynceus were sons of Aphareus and Ἀρήνη (ᾶ), a Messenian hero and heroine: hence the brothers are Ἀφαρητιδαί (Pind. N. 10. 65). Idas and Apollo were rivals for the love of Marpessa, daughter of the Aetolian Εὐνός. Evenus compelled suitors for his daughter's hand to engage in some contest with him, slew them when they were vanquished, and roofed a temple with their skulls. This was told by Bacchylides (as we learn from schol. Pind. I. 4. 92), probably in a lost part of this poem. Idas, having received a winged chariot (ὑπόπτερον ἄρμα Apoll. 1. 7. § 8) from Poseidon, carried off Marpessa from her paternal home. Evenus pursued the couple; at the river Lycormas in Aetolia, finding that he could not overtake them, he slaughtered his horses, and drowned himself in the river, which thenceforth bore his name. Idas brought Marpessa to his home in Messene. Apollo came to take her from him. The undaunted hero bent his bow

against the archer-god; when Zeus intervened, and allowed Marpessa to take her choice. She chose Idas, fearing that her immortal lover might forsake her in her old age.

Here is the text of the fragment:—

- Σπάρτα ποτ' ἐν[  
ξανθαὶ Λακεδα[  
τοιόνδε μέλος κ[  
ὄτ' ἄγετο καλλιπα[  
5 κόραν θρασυκαρ[  
Μάρπησσαν ἰο[  
φυγῶν θανάτου]  
ἀναξίαιος Ποσι[  
ἵππους τέ οἱ ἴσαν[  
10 Πλευρῶν' ἐς εὐκτ[  
χρυσάσπιδος νίο[

The restoration of the first five verses is easy, so far as their general sense is concerned (and that is all which we can hope to recover). They may have run somewhat as follows:—

Σπάρτα ποτ' ἐν [εὐρυχώρῳ v. Wilam.,  
Headlam]  
ξανθαὶ Λακεδαιμονίων  
τοιόνδε μέλος κ[όραι ἄδον v. Wilam.]  
ὄτ' ἄγετο καλλιπά[ρμον Platt]  
κόραν θρασυκάρδιος Ἰδας.

To restore verses 6-11 is more difficult. Three conditions of the problem must first be noted. (1) We must have a verb to which Ποσιδᾶν (Ποσειδᾶν) in v. 8 can be subject, and ἵππους in 9 object. (2) The place of τε shows that it cannot link this new sentence, in which Poseidon is subject, to the former sentence, in which Idas is subject and ἄγετο verb. τε must link ἵππους to another acc. (which may have either preceded or followed ἵππους); and this other acc. was probably that of a word denoting chariot. Cp. Pind. O. 1. 86 (in the parallel story of Pelops being aided by Poseidon to win Hippodameia from Oenomaus), τὸν μὲν ἀγάλλον θεὸς | ἔδωκεν δίφρον τε χρύσειον περὶοῖσιν τ' ἀκίμαντας ἵππους. (3) Whatever may have been the structure of the whole passage, Πλευρῶν' ἐς εὐκτ[μένην] cannot go with ἄγετο in v. 4. It was to Peloponnesus, not to Pleuron, that Idas brought home Marpessa. Pleuron was near the river Evenus. Evenus figures in mythology as a king in Aetolia, great-grandson of Pleuron (Apoll. 1. 7. § 8). Pleuron is here manifestly the seat of Evenus, to which Idas went for the purpose of winning Marpessa. Simonides had, indeed, named Ὀρτυγίαν τήν

ἐν Χαλκίδι (in Euboea) as the home from which Idas carried her off (schol. *Il.* 9. 556); but, in placing her home at Pleuron, B. was probably following the more generally current version. (4) Evenus was the son of Ares and Demonice (Apoll. *l.c.*). The last word in v. 11 was probably Ἀρῆος. We may now restore (*exempli gratia*) somewhat as follows:—

Μάρπησσαν ἰο[πλόκαμον],  
 φυχῶν θανάτου [τέλος, ὡς πόρε δίφρον]  
 ἀναξιάλος Ποσι[δᾶν]  
 ἵππους τέ οἱ ἰσαν[έμους· ὁ γὰρ ἐλθὼν]  
 Πλευρῶν' ἐς εὐκτ[ιμέναν],  
 χρυσάσπιδος υἱὸν Ἀρῆος]

The acc. ἰὼν (which euphony as well as the context makes more likely than νῖος) probably depended on a verb denoting some action of Idas of which Evenus was the object (*e.g.* ἤγησε κόραν). B.'s account of the manner in which Evenus had dealt with former suitors (schol. *Pind.* *I.* 4. 92) may have followed in connection with this passage.

The title of the poem in the MS. is ΙΔΑΣ ΛΑΚΕΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΟΙΣ. The corresponding ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΙΣΙ in the title of XIX is shown by the internal evidence of that fragment to be right. Even though we assume that these titles can claim no older authority than that of an Alexandrian editor, we may well suppose that, if XX had come down entire, we should have found in it some internal evidence confirmatory of what the opening lines suggest,—that it was written for a Lacedaemonian festival, and presumably for a festival at Sparta. The Lacedaemonian maidens sang how Idas carried off Marpessa

from Pleuron—to what place? To Messenia, as the old legend of Μεσσηνίος Ἰδᾶς (Theocr. 22. 208) told? That is not likely. Pausanias (3. 13. 1) saw the tomb of Idas and Lynceus at Sparta. He remarks that one might have expected them to be buried in Messenia. [The tomb of their Messenian father Aphareus was the scene, in the old legend, of their death in conflict with the Dioscuri,—Lynceus perishing by the spear of Polydeuces, and Idas by the lightning of Zeus, *Pind.* *N.* 10. 66 ff.] But, adds Pausanias, the misfortunes of the Messenians, and their long exile from Peloponnesus, had dimmed their local traditions, and had made it possible 'for any people who were so disposed' to claim those traditions as their own. Ovid (*Fasti* V. 708) further illustrates this: he places the fatal encounter of the Apharetidae with the Dioscuri at *Aphidna*—not the Attic, but the Laconian: cp. Steph. Byz. Ἀφιδνα δῆμος Ἀττικῆς. ἔστι καὶ Λακωνικῆς, ὅθεν ἦσαν αἱ Λενκίπιδες (the maidens beloved by the Apharetidae). There can be little doubt, then, that in the ἐπιθαλάμιον of Idas and Marpessa, 'sung of yore at Sparta by the golden-haired maidens of Lacedaemon,' Lacedaemon was the home to which Idas brought home his bride. Simonides, if the schol. on *Il.* 9. 559 can be trusted, had made Idas a Lacedaemonian, but mentioned Arene in Messenia as the place to which Idas brought Marpessa. This fragment of Bacchylides has thus the mythological interest of affording the earliest testimony which we possess to the Spartan usurpation of the Messenian legend.

R. C. JEBB.

#### NOTES ON MACROBIUS.

##### FALLACY OF HOMONYMS.

ALL readers must concur in Eyssenhardt's eulogy on his predecessor: 'Ludovicus Ianius, cuius ingenti tot annorum diligentiae vix dici potest quantum debeant qui in Macrobio aut emendando aut enarrando versantur.'

It is only the more needful to warn students against occasional slips, even in so learned and vigilant a guide as L. Jan.

In book vii. c. 8, we read:

§ 9. Caecina subiecit: Dum de calore loquimur, admonet rei quam semper quaesitu dignam putavi,

cur in Aegypto, quae regionum aliarum calidissima est, vinum non calida, sed, paene dixerim, frigida virtute nascatur? § 10. Ad hoc Diarius: Usu tibi, Albine, compertum est aquas quae vel de altis puteis vel de fontibus hauriuntur fumare hieme, aestate frigescere. . . . § 11. Quod ergo ubique alternatur varietate temporis, hoc in Aegypto semper est, cuius aer semper est in calore. Frigus enim ima petens vitium radicibus involvit et talem dat qualitatem suco inde nascenti. Ideo regionis calidae vina calore caruerunt.

Here *vitium radicibus* is evidently 'vine-roots.' Yet Jan takes *vitium* as the nominative neuter of the second declension:

'*appositio est vocis frigus, ut fere idem valeat ac eas vitians.*' Some sixty-three years ago a grammatical puzzle was current in Christ's Hospital, and perhaps in other schools, which might, had he known it, have saved Jan from this error. '*Homo in Hispaniam natura naturam vitium visum.*' '*A woman (homo taken as epicene) about to swim into Spain to see the nature of the vines.*' Of all puzzles in language homonymy, the existence of words identical in sound or spelling, or both, but different in root and meaning, is perhaps the most ensnaring. Reformers of English spelling seem unconscious of the risk. Some time ago a Board-school master named *seed*, *supersede*, *proceed*, and *recede* as examples of words requiring to be reduced to a Precrustean uniformity. That the last two words stood on a different footing from the others, never entered his thoughts. No doubt *exceed*, *proceed*, *succeed*, ought forthwith to be conformed to *accede*, *cede*, *concede*, *intercede*, *precede*, *recede*. Our friend the schoolmaster would no doubt destroy all distinction between *cession* and *session*. The only time that I saw Robert Browning, he spoke strongly against phonic agitators: 'Their success would be

disastrous; I rejoice to think that it is impossible.'

In another passage of the seventh book (c. 14, § 17), Jan has missed the meaning not less signally.

Sicut igitur diximus, cum lumen quod pergit e nobis per aeris lucem in corpus inciderit, impletur officium videndi: sed ut possit res *visa* cognosci, renuntiat visam speciem rationi sensus oculorum, et illa advocata memoria recognoscit: ergo videre oculorum est indicare rationis.

On the last words, Jan notes:—

Infinitivi locum tenent nomina substantivorum. Vulgo post *est* ponitur comma, ut genitivi pendeant ab hoc verbo, sed videntur ii potius referendi esse ad infinitivos, ut *videre oculorum* sit subiectum, et *indicare rationis* praedicatum, das *Sehen der Augen* ist ein *Urtheilen der Vernunft*.

Far from identifying the functions of eye and thought, Macrobius carefully discriminates them (cf. § 18 '*quia trinum est officium quod visum complet ad dinoscendam figuram, sensus ratio memoria, sensus rem visam rationi refundit, illa quid visum sit recordatur*'). Retain the old punctuation: 'Sight is of the eyes, judgement of thought.' Eyssenhardt follows Jan.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

Cambridge.

#### PLUTARCH, ARISTEIDES, CH. 22.

'*Ἀριστείδης...γράφει ψήφισμα κοινὴν εἶναι τὴν πολιτείαν καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἐξ Ἀθηναίων πάντων αἰρεῖσθαι.*'

If we follow Dr. Sandys on 'Aθ. Πολ. 22, § 5, and take *ἄρχοντας* 'in the widest sense of the term,' then we seem to make Plutarch contradict his own assertion in *Cimon* 8, that the strategi of 468 B.C. were '*ἀπὸ φυλῆς μιᾶς ἑκάστον.*'

If Plutarch meant by *ἄρχοντας* the nine archons, then there is apparently a discrepancy between this passage and the statements of the 'Aθ. Πολ. about the various changes in the mode of appointing the Athenian archons.

Mr. Greenidge attempts to reconcile Aristotle and Plutarch by the conjecture that in 479-8 'a decree of the people introduced by Aristides, changed the land census into a census of all property,' *Outlines of Gk. Const. Hist.* page 141-2. Against this the reviewer in *Class. Rev.* May 1897, page 218, raised serious objections, to which may be added the following:—

In the first place the theory adopted by Mr. Greenidge fails to explain how Plutarch's version of Aristides' *ψήφισμα* arose. Such a reformation of census methods would not per se make the *ἄρχοντες* chosen from all Athenians: there would still remain *ζευγίται* and *θῆτες* as ineligible after the change as before.

Secondly, there is very little proof that Solon's census had regard to land only. A. II. 7, § 4 '*ἐκ τῆς οἰκείας*' seems to be the only passage quoted from ancient authorities that is anything like a clear statement of any such restriction to landed property.

Further, if we adopt Mr. Greenidge's view we are at once confronted with the question, why do not A. II. and other ancient authorities attribute this fundamental constitutional change to Aristides? It would surely have been important enough to attract notice, to be recorded under its proper date, and ascribed to its real author.

As a matter of fact no ancient authority attributes the change from landed property assessment to an assessment of all property

to Aristeides, nor to anybody else. The natural inference from this silentium is that no such change was ever made at Athens at any one definite time, by any individual statesman. All property was intended to be counted from the first. The average yield of the harvest is said to have been the basis of Solon's system, because that was, generally speaking, the only ready criterion for assessing a citizen's wealth that was known to the fiscal authorities, such as they were, in those early times at Athens. Other kinds of property besides land were gradually taken into account in the census, exactly in proportion as the census officials gradually acquired the means and ability to detect and estimate them. Meanwhile the purchasing power of money kept declining, as the amount of coin in circulation kept increasing, till the minimum *τίμημα* recorded as fixed in money for each census class became ludicrously small for the purpose for which it was originally intended. But in democratic Athens no one dared propose to raise the minimum assessment for any census class, so the Solonian census classes became obsolete so far as distinctions of constitutional status between individual citizens were concerned. The result was the state of affairs described in A. II. 7 ad fin. καὶ νῦν ἐπειδὴν ἔρηται τὸν μέλλοντα κληροῦσθαι τιν' ἀρχήν, ποῖον τέλος τελεί, οὐδ' ἂν εἰς εἰποι θητικόν, and A. II. 47, § 1, which says of the ταμίαι, 'κλ[ηροῦται] δ' εἰς ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς, ἐκ πεντακοσιομεδίωνων κατὰ τὸν Σόλωνος νόμον (ἐπεὶ γὰρ ὁ νόμος κύριός ἐστιν), ἄρχαι δ' ὁ λαχόντων πάντων πένης ἦ.'

But is Plut. *Arist.* 22 really at variance with the A. II. ? The last change in the mode of appointment of the nine archons before 479-8 B.C. recorded in the A. II. is stated in ch. 22, § 5 in these words: 'ἐπὶ Τελεσίνου ἀρχοντος ἐκνάμευσαν τοὺς ἐννέα ἀρχοντας κατὰ φυλὰς, ἐκ τῶν προκριθέντων ὑπὸ τῶν δημοτῶν πεντακοσίων, τότε μετὰ τὴν τυραννίδα πρῶτον (οἱ δὲ πρότεροι πάντες ἦσαν αἰρετοί).' That is, the demes elected 500 candidates, and out of those 500 the nine archons and their secretary were appointed by lot, one being taken from the fifty candidates of each of the ten Cleisthenian φυλαί.

This, then, was the method adopted in 487-6 B.C. Why should we not accept the obvious *prima facie* means of combining this with Plut. *Arist.* 22, and suppose that in 479-8 Aristeides arranged that all the nine archons and their secretary should be appointed by lot from the whole number of the πρόκριτοι, ten being taken out of the 500,

without any regard being paid to the φυλαί at all? If Aristeides' ψήφισμα meant no more than this it becomes more conceivable how the author of the A. II., or his collaborators, might possibly have omitted it as unimportant. The archons lost most of their political importance in 487 B.C. When the A. II. was written the archons had for some considerable time been appointed entirely by lot, and their appointment was so mere a formality that it was of little consequence whether they were allotted κατὰ φυλὰς or ἐξ ἀπάντων.

Have we any real evidence that the archons were appointed κατὰ φυλὰς after 478? Two passages in A. II., 8, § 1, 'ἐτι διαμένει ταῖς φυλαῖς τὸ δέκα κληροῦν ἐκάστην, εἴτ' ἐκ τούτων κναμεύ[ειν],' and 55, § 1, '[νῦν] δὲ κληροῦσιν θεσμοθέτας μὲν ἐξ καὶ γραμματεῖα τοῖς, ἐπὶ δ' ἀρχοντα καὶ βασι[λέα] καὶ πολέμαρχον, κατὰ μέρος ἐξ ἐκάστης <τῆς> φυλῆς,' seem to say that in 329-323 B.C. the archons were appointed one from each tribe. But do they necessarily mean more than some such development as this?—As the archons lost political importance the nomination of πρόκριτοι by the demes became a farce, so the πρόκριτοι themselves came to be appointed by lot at some date not specified. Next the allotment of candidates by the demes was felt to be an unnecessary waste of time and trouble; to avoid this the preliminary sortition of candidates was conducted by the officials of the φυλαί, each φυλή appointing by lot ten candidates. Out of the 100 candidates the nine archons and secretary were nominated by lot ἐξ ἀπάντων.

This guess would be confirmed if instances could be discovered where in any particular year, after 478, more than one archon came from one φυλή, as was the case with the strategoi who were elected πρότερον μὲν (e.g. 469 B.C.) ἀφ' ἐκάστης τῆς φυλῆς ἓνα, νῦν δ' (329-323 B.C.) ἐξ ἀπάντων, A. II. 61, § 1,

On A. II. 55, § 1 Dr. Sandys' note reads 'It has hitherto been uncertain whether in the annual appointment of archons, the holders of the office were taken from different tribes. Those who (like Schömann, p. 410) accepted this view, supposed that one of the ten tribes was unrepresented. We now learn that the tenth tribe supplied the γραμματεὺς to the θεσμοθέται.' If that is to be accepted as authoritative, there still remains a possible, and plausible, explanation of Plut. *Arist.* 22 that will not be inconsistent with the data in A. II.

Aristeides' ψήφισμα may have been merely a temporary expedient for appointment of state officers in the midst of the unsettlement



and confusion that must have prevailed in Athens and Attica just after the departure of the Mede. What more natural than a temporary resort even to election at such a juncture? Appointment by the ordinary methods of that date, but from the whole body of eligible citizens (ἐξ Ἀθηναίων πάντων)

instead of κατὰ φυλάς from candidates elected by the demes, is still more easily intelligible. Many of the demes were probably still ἀνάστατοι, and their organisation in confusion.

E. J. BROOKS.

#### A NOTE ON PLATAEA IN DR. FRAZER'S PAUSANIAS.

As the question of the accounts of the Battle and of the Siege of Plataea in Herodotus and Thucydides respectively is one of considerable historical importance, and one, moreover, with which I have some first-hand acquaintance, I should like to say a few words as to certain views which Dr. Frazer has put forward on some very important points in the two narratives. Were it merely a question of the conclusions which he and I have drawn from the evidence obtainable, I should not consider it necessary to say aught on the subject. Given the evidence, other students, who have not first-hand knowledge, can form a capable judgment. But when those who have first-hand knowledge differ as to the evidence, it is desirable that the reasons for difference should be in so far as possible sifted. I think, I confess, that such differences as do exist in the present case, have arisen from a misapprehension on Dr. Frazer's part of the real nature of this evidence. It would demand almost superhuman care to avoid such misapprehensions in a work of the magnitude of Dr. Frazer's Pausanias, where the amount of material under review is so vast and so complicated.

The notes to which I am going to refer are in vol. v., § 2 of the Pausanias.

##### 1. *The three Passes on to the Field of Battle.*

- (1) On the Athens-Eleusis-Thebes route (Dryos Kephalaë).
- (2) On the Athens-Plataea route.
- (3) On the Megara-Plataea route.

With regard to the second of these, Dr. Frazer says that he follows me with some misgivings. He says that on the Austrian map, as well as on the French survey, the route to Plataea from Athens diverges from the Athens-Eleusis-Thebes route, not as I state it does, south of Eleutherae, but that it goes through the Dryos-Kephalaë Pass,

NO. CIV. VOL. XII.

and then diverges west along the line of the present loop-road to Kriekouki.

The French survey I have not got by me. I have the map of the Austrian survey, viz. :—

The well-known Austrian map of Greece, revised by Kiepert, 1885, scale 1 : 300,000.

Which shows

- (a) The road *via* Dryos Kephalaë.
- (b) Another road branching from this south of Eleutherae, going to Vilia, and then over Pass No. 2 to Kriekouki.

But more than this, at the north end of this Pass No. 2, a little west of Kriekouki, are the tracks of wheels deeply worn in the limestone rock pointing right into this pass, and marking plainly the route of the Plataea-Athens road.

##### 2. *The νῆσος.*

I seem to have half convinced Dr. Frazer of the existence and identity of the νῆσος. I need not now repeat the description of it given in the monograph the Royal Geographical Society published for me. I do not think that anyone who had once stood at the point on the side of Kithaeron, where the streams part, and looked down on to the νῆσος I have indicated could doubt for one moment that it is exactly the piece of ground Herodotus describes, and exactly as he describes it (ix. 50). Dr. Frazer raises two difficulties :—

- (1) He says the streams do not unite until far down in the plain.

That was true at the time I was at Plataea. But in the alluvial plain the water-courses are liable to rapid and frequent changes of bed. Leake's map (Northern Greece) shows that these streams did join one another in his time close to the foot of the νῆσος indicated.

o

- (2) Dr. Frazer says that this *vḥstos* is thirty stades at least from the Asopus, and that 'to meet this last difficulty Mr. Grundy is driven to suppose that Herodotus was here speaking, not of the Asopus, but one of its tributaries, which rises ten stades from the island so-called.'

I was not, however, driven to this supposition by that difficulty; but by a much more serious one, viz., Herodotus' description of the second position of the Greeks.

In ix. 25, he speaks of the Greeks being near the Spring of Gargaphia and the *τεμένος* of the Hero Androcrates, which was at least from one and a half to two miles from the Thespian Asopus, and then says at the end of the chapter, οὗτοι μὲν νυν ταχέστες ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσωπῷ ἐστρατοπεδεύοντο.

This 'Asopus' must have been the stream A 1 in my map; the stream to which I refer the measurement of ten stades in relation to the island.

It was the commonest thing possible in our own country and elsewhere before the days of accurate maps for the name of a well-known river to be applied to several of the streams which form its head waters. The Thames is a notable case in point. In my paper on Plataea, I ascribed the so-called mistake to Herodotus. I should now be more inclined to believe that the Plataeans did actually call A 1 the Asopus. It is one of the head streams of this river, and is much closer to Plataea than the others.

### 3. The tombs of those who fell in the Battle.

Dr. Frazer ascribes to me the opinion that the rock graves near which the Megara road must have entered Plataea, are the tombs of those who fell in the battle. He refers to p. 7 of my monograph. The opinion

there expressed is that of Dr. Merethides. I confess, however, that the language in which I stated that opinion might mislead the reader as to my own view. My impression is that a cemetery either previously existed or grew up round the site of the graves of those who fell in the battle. As to their position, Pausanias is singularly clear. Speaking of the road from Megara, he says κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἔσοδον μάλιστα τὴν ἐς Πλάταιαν τάφοι τῶν πρὸς Μήδους μαχασαμένων εἰσὶ.

The position of the pass and of the ground in relation to it determines the line of the road, which passes close by these rock graves. I do not think anyone acquainted with Greek history would be likely to assert seriously that the whole of those slain in the battle were buried in such graves. As a fact, in discussing the topography of the battle-field, my interest did not lie in determining who was or was not buried in these rock tombs, but in discovering the locality to which Pausanias so clearly points as having been the site of the burial of those who fell in the battle.

### (4) The Siege of Plataea.

I have indicated the north-west portion of the site, as cut off by what is called, as it seems to me, somewhat misleadingly, the lower cross wall, as having been the fortified city which was the object of attack in the siege. Dr. Frazer objects that the remains of this cross wall belong to a later date. That I have never doubted, but I think the fact that he mentions, viz., that all the walls on the site are eleven feet in thickness, would point to the later walls having been erected on the site of earlier ones, on those lines, that is, where the surface rock had been previously levelled for the reception of the earlier wall foundations.

G. B. GRUNDY.

### ἀγαν AND μέγα, ἀνάντα AND LAT. MONS.

REFERRING to Mr. Fay's courteous reply touching *ingens* (*Class. Rev.* Feb. 1898, page 17 f.) I wish to make a few remarks.

I thought that all students of philology knew that 'a large number of scholars recognise' the certainty 'of the existence of the gradation' Skt. *a* | *ma*, Gk. *a* | *μe*, of which I hold that there are no certain examples. It seems, however, that for

certainty I must substitute 'plausibility,' or 'probability,' so that Mr. Fay after all agrees with me. But we differ, in that he seems to live in hopes of being able to say 'certainty' some day.

The extension of meaning of Ger. *untar* to 'zwischen' is no evidence for the identity of the fundamental meaning of Skt. *mādhya*s with that of Skt. *ādhas* or Eng. *under*.

Mr. Fay is not sure about ἄμμε, Skt. *asmā*; so that as far as Greek goes his only 'probable' examples are ἄγαν, ἄγαμαι, by μέγα, Skt. *mah*, ἄναρτα by Lat. *mons*. I cannot accept the view that Skt. *medhā* is fundamentally identical in meaning with Skt. *addhā*. These, with ingens by Skt. *mahānt*, are all Mr. Fay's select instances.

I think that, but for deference to authorities, few would aver their mutual support is effective. Is not Skt. *aghās* = *maghā* more probable than any of them?

Mr. Fay's identification of the reduplicated form γίγας with βίβας 'high-stepping' depends upon a very free translation, as βίβας only means 'striding,' an action not peculiar to giants. But we know that the Greeks regarded them as γηγερείς.

I hold that *ingens* may have originally meant *indigena* and that the *-gens* and γίγας are identical with *gens* in fundamental meaning, but applied individually instead of collectively as in the Lat. substantive.

Mr. Fay's objections as to Form, Signification, and Composition thus seem to be irrelevant. Still, the alleged connection with Eng. *ken*, Ger. *kennen*, is possible.

The Skt. *addhā*, Avest. *azdā* = ὄντως and may be developed from an atonic derivative of the root *as* 'be.'

As Mr. Fay equates ἄγαμαι with Skt. *mah*, he cannot object on phonetic grounds to the cognation of ἄγαν, ἄγαμαι with Eng. *awe*; and it is surely incumbent on him to disprove such a cognation (which is supported by αἰνός, δεινός, Ger. *schrecklich* = 'frightful,' 'immense'). If ἄγαν be 'a neuter adverb of participial nature,' its form would allow the signification 'awingly,' so that I can give up my suggestion as to form without damaging my main position. However, Theognis may have borrowed a Delphic or Boeotian form, while in Attic and Herodotus 2-173, the familiar Delphic 'μηδὲν ἄγαν' and

in Attic only also the *ā* of λῆαν might prevent the change to \*ἄγγη\*.

The instances adduced which concern *n* instead of *m* are perhaps remotely relevant; but, as I began by confining my statement to *m*, Mr. Fay cannot object to my continuing to let *n* alone. I have briefly noticed such instances in my *Indo-Germanic Sonants and Consonants*, § 26, p. 18, in which work the theory of Indo-Germanic sonant nasals is conclusively demolished.

By committing himself to the view that Lat. *mont-* signifies 'peak,' Mr. Fay raises a semasiological barrier between it and ἄναρτα 'uphill,' O.H.G. *andi* 'brow,' Skt. *anta-s* 'end.' The fundamental meaning of these three forms is 'opposition.' A 'brow' is that which *confronts*; an 'up-hill' slope rises *against* one; a physical 'end' is primarily a line or surface which by opposing itself limits motion or extension in a certain direction, and secondarily it means the 'last motion' of that which moves and is opposed, or the 'extremity' of that which has its extension opposed. A 'peak,' *qua* peak, projects, stands out, rises up, but is not regarded as opposing. A brow, *qua* brow, though near the top, yet is not the top. A 'peak' is an 'end' in the secondary sense, but an 'end' is only sometimes incidentally a 'peak' or 'point.'

Mr. Fay cites Prellwitz for μενθήρη = 'brow,' but according to Hesychius it means φροντίς, μέριμνα. As the form of μενθήρη presents difficulties as well as the sense, it cannot be regarded as affecting the affinities of Lat. *mons* appreciably.

A large percentage of the fallacies rife among German philologists and their followers seems due to loose treatment of the meanings of words. If Mr. Fay has not erred in good company he has at any rate erred in fashionable company.

C. A. M. FENNELL.

#### NOTE ON ARISTOPHANES *ECCLESIAZUSAE*, 502.

ἅπαντα καὶ μύσει σάκον πρὸς τοῖν γνάθων ἔχοντα·

For the corrupt μύσει Palmer wished to read παῦσαι: quod uerum uidetur to Blaydes.

Read rather μὴ θέϊ, 'do not run about.' The corruption is due: (1) to confusion of C and Θ (2) to itacism.

J. A. NAIRN.

## CONWAY'S ITALIC DIALECTS.

*The Italic Dialects edited with a Grammar and a Glossary.* By R. S. CONWAY, M.A., Professor of Latin in University College, Cardiff; late Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. 2 vols. (Cambridge, at the University Press, 1897. 30s.)

FOR the study of Italic dialects we have hitherto had to rely on two manuals: Zvetaieff *Inscriptiones Italiae Inferioris Dialecticae* (Moscow, 1886, pp. 184), containing all the dialectal inscriptions except the Umbrian, and Buecheler *Umbrica* (Bonn, 1883, pp. 224). Facsimiles of the Umbrian inscriptions were given in Bréal *Les Tables Eugubines* (Paris, 1875, 25 fr.), and of the others in Zvetaieff *Inscriptiones Italiae Mediae* (Leipzig, 1885, 30 m.). To the student of Umbrian, new publications are hardly necessary. Nothing could be more satisfactory than M. Bréal's facsimiles, and little has been added to the explanation of the records since the careful and thorough edition by Buecheler. But Zvetaieff's plates, which occasionally were photographs not of the inscriptions themselves but merely of drawings of the inscriptions, left something to be desired. And thanks to the impulse given by a course of lectures by Prof. Brugmann at Leipzig, the interpretation and analysis of the Oscan and other dialectal remains has made not a little progress, a work in which Prof. Conway has played a part along with other pupils of Prof. Brugmann, such as Dr. Buck, Dr. von Planta, and Dr. Bronisch. The time might be said to have come for a new publication which should provide us with reliable reproductions or descriptions of the dialectal remains and with an improved interpretation and grammatical analysis. And yet it is with a slight feeling of regret that one relinquishes the trim and handy manuals of Buecheler and Zvetaieff for the two *μεγάλα βιβλία* that have appeared almost simultaneously, Prof. Conway's *Italic Dialects* (2 vols, pp. 686) and Dr. von Planta's *Grammatik der Oskisch-Umbrischen Dialekte* (2 vols, pp. 600 and 772).

Of the two books, Prof. Conway's is undoubtedly the more suitable for English students. Its clear arrangement and neat type give it an immense advantage over its German rival. But anyone who wishes to push his study of the Italic dialects to the furthest limits will have to proceed to

the fuller, though more unwieldy, Grammar of Dr. von Planta. I do not know that it would not have been better if Prof. Conway had delayed the publication of his book until he could have availed himself of Dr. von Planta's researches. For though he has paid a visit to Italy to verify the reading of a number of inscriptions, Dr. von Planta seems to have spent more time and labour over them; and where the two authorities differ, one is generally inclined to put more faith in the readings attested by the latter. It is annoying to find the unlikely form *úniuersim* 'universim' in an Oscan inscription (No. 114, 'now in the Naples Museum, where I read it in March, 1894') re-attested by Prof. Conway, while Dr. von Planta assures us that the true reading is *inim verehias* 'et civitatis.' I could have wished, too, that Prof. Conway had followed Dr. von Planta's plan of appending to each inscription a Latin translation.

One element of Prof. Conway's book which is lacking in the German work is the Lists of Place Names (ancient and modern) and Personal Names of the dialectal districts. Dr. von Planta tells us in the preface to his second volume that he had intended to include lists of the kind, but had given up the idea, partly because he thought them more suitable for a separate publication, partly because it was impossible to secure a full list of Umbrian Names until the completion of Vol. xi. of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*.<sup>1</sup> He has, however, throughout his two volumes quoted any Personal or Local Names which threw light on the phonetic laws of the dialects or any other topic of discussion. For example, in illustration of the difficult words *smursim-e*, *Coredier* on the Iguvine Tables, he refers to the names of two places in the neighbourhood of Gubbio (*Iguvium*), viz., *Morcia* and *Gorregi*, which I do not find in Prof. Conway's lists.

On p. xxv. Prof. Conway explains the principles on which his lists of Personal Names have been compiled. They are taken from the Indices of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, and are arranged in different classes accordingly as they occur 'frequently,'

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Conway (p. 443n.) says of these Umbrian Names: 'without the aid of an index I did not think it worth while to attempt a collection of the cognomina.'



i.e. at least six times, less than six times, or only once. The uncertainty of such an arrangement is obvious; but it is better to have a 'rough and ready' list than to have no list at all. And it is extremely interesting to get a bird's-eye view of these dialectal names *Magius*, *Jubellius*, *Blossius* and the like. They seem to transfer one to quite a new world of vocabulary; and a careful study of them could not fail to produce valuable results for the Ethnography of ancient Italy. I trust that some reader of Prof. Conway's book will be impelled to undertake for the Names of Italy what Prof. Fick has done for the Greek Names, and will add to the names supplied by the Indices to the *Corpus* those that are scattered through the writings of ancient authors.

Here are some small matters which have occurred to me in reading Prof. Conway's pages: (p. 31) *proiectad* of the Luceria inscription (*C.I.L.* ix. 782) will, if we admit Osc. *tt* for *ss*, be equivalent to *\*proiecissat* (cf. *incipissat*), as *fundatid*, *parentatid* of the same inscr. to *fundassit*, *parentassit*; (p. 42)

why *Anīmula* in Plaut. *Mil.* 648 rather than *Anīmula*?; (p. 50) Prof. Conway's identification of Osc. *Evkhūi* with Hesychius' *Εὐκόλος* *Ἐρμῆς παρὰ Μεταπορτίους* seems certainly right; (p. 223) the *s* of Lat. *rosa* has been admirably explained by Prof. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Comm. Metr.* ii. 21; (p. 321) for 'Magulini' read Magulnii; (p. 512) how can Lat. *pār* Neut. correspond to *\*pāros* as *vīr* to *\*vīros*?; (p. 597) *baetere* not 'betere' seems to be the true form of the Verb, the *ae* becoming *i* in compounds, *ad-bītere*, etc.; (p. 603) the connection of Lat. *dignus* and *decet* should, I think, be abandoned; (p. 615) the explanation of *eehiia*- as *\*eevehiiā*—connected with Lat. *veho* is supported by Skutsch's discovery that *akkāto-* was the Oscan form of Lat. *advocatus*; (p. 616) Osc. *eituns* would surely be Lat. *\*itōnes* not *\*itōnes*; (p. 625) is Osc. *Herukinaī* (epithet of the Oscan Venus) not to be explained as *Erycinae*?; (p. 637) why does the *u* of *Numasioi* show it to be a distinct formation from *Numerius*? Would not *Nūmāsio-* become *Numerio-*?

W. M. LINDSAY.

#### HERWERDEN'S *PAX*.

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΕΙΡΗΝΗ cum scholiorum antiquorum excerptis recognovit et annotavit H. VAN HERWERDEN. 2 vols. Lugduni Batavorum apud A. W. Sijthoff. 1897. 8 fl. 15.

This is an elaborate but yet not quite a satisfactory edition of the *Pax*. The most valuable part of the book should be the text, in constituting which Herwerden has used a collation of the Ravennas made by himself in 1856, and a collation of Venetus 474 made by Cobet in 1842. Such a text ought to be distinctly in advance of those current, which still depend on Bekker's collations of R. and V.

When recently in Venice I was allowed through the kindness of the authorities of the Marciana to take about forty photographs of the text of the *Pax* as given by V. I have compared Cobet's collation very carefully with these. In many passages he restores to us the correct reading which Bekker missed:—e.g. 469 ἀλλ' ἄγε τὸν ξυνάλεκτον (which perhaps supports Dobree's ἀλλ' ἄγετε ξυνανέκετε). 1040 θνλήματα. 1195 ἐπισφύρει. 227 παρασκευάζετε. But I have

noted the following passages in which the collation fails:—56 V. has γὰρ not μὲν. 113 V. has λάθραι. 133 V. has αἰετοῦ. 137 V. has μέλ' ἐάν not μέλε ἄν. 246 It should be noted that V. has ὁ Μέγαρο, Μέγαρ(α), (α) being erased. The hiatus perhaps explains the corruption in ἐπιτρίψεσθ'. 282 V. anticipates Porson by reading Λακεδαιμονίοισιν. 355

τε V. reads κατρίμμεθα (sic) in *rasura*. 374 V. μοι νῦν not νῦν μοι. 386 V. R. read ἐμοῦ not ἐμοῦ γε (I γε comes from Ald.). 402 κλέπτει τε V. The old report that αἱ τε are in *ras.* is correct. 446 The old report of V. πάσχοιτο τοιαῦταθ' is right. 473 Τρυγ. praef R.] so too V. 528 V. assigns to Τρυγ. 584 V. reads ἐδάμμεν not ἐδάμην. 628, 630 V. marks the speaker by a line only. 703 V. reads ἰδὼν not ὁρῶν. 704 V. reads γεγενῆσθ' ἐν τῇ πόλει. 711 V. has καταγέλασας written in *ras.* 717 V. has κατέδει not κατέδη. 939 V. omits μὲν with S. (Ven. 475). 746 V. also reads ἐπαθ' (I corr.). 759 V. has ἡμῶν. 864 V. has φανῇ. 932 V. has λέγη not λέγει. 953 V. has τοῦθ' εἰ. 986 V. S. read ἡμῶν. 1144 V. reads ἄφανε not ἄφηνε. 1226 V. ποιήση not ποιήσει. 1240 τί δ' ἄρα V. as

S. 1344 V. <sup>ο</sup>πρ<sup>ο</sup>τραγμέν<sup>ο</sup>υ [πρ<sup>ο</sup>στ. R.]. It is worth noting that πρ in V. = πρ<sup>ο</sup>στ. Cobet was aware of this as is shown by his reading πρ<sup>ο</sup>στ<sup>ο</sup>ρε<sup>ο</sup>ν in V. in *Vespae* 21.

Cobet's collation of V. has been known hitherto only from the excerpts which he gave to his friend Hirschig for an edition of the *Vespae* published in 1847. These give the reading accurately in nearly every case. I can only suppose that he was not satisfied with the accuracy of the other parts of his collation as he never published them during his lifetime.

I have tested parts of Herwerden's own collation of R. by a collation of that MS. in my possession. In some readings not noticed by Bekker, they agree *e.g.* 379 σὺ 458 καλοῖς 808 εἶχεν 1122 κωιδίων. I have marked the following discrepancies. 7 περικυκλήσας (H. περικυλίσας). 52 ἵπ<sup>ε</sup>ρ τοῦ-<sup>ο</sup>τισιν (H. ἵπ<sup>ε</sup>ρ τοῦτον). 101 ἐπικλεί<sup>ο</sup>ν (H. ἐπικλεί<sup>ο</sup>ν). 163 θ' (H. δ'). 165 Πειραεῖ. 185 ἐστιν (H. ἐστ'). 187 om. R. 314 καὶ om. R. 386 ἐμοῦ (H. ἐμοῦ γε). 553 R. also has καὶ ἀκοντί<sup>ο</sup>ν. 568 R. om. αὐτῶν. 943 R. V. τοῦθ' εὔ (H. τοῦδ' εὔ). 1054 φρασε<sup>ο</sup>ν (H. φράσεθ').

It must be confessed that neither Cobet's collation of V. nor Herwerden's of R. gives a completely trustworthy account of what is contained in those manuscripts. It is to be hoped that Zacher will not be long in finishing the critical edition of Aristophanes begun by Von Velsen.

Herwerden gives no account of the manuscripts of the play beyond the bare enumeration on p. ii. Hence it is difficult to know whether he has any valid reasons (beyond deference to the authority of Blaydes to whom he dedicates his book), for treating S.<sup>1</sup> throughout as a manuscript of independent value. Certainly Cobet is in no two minds about the matter. 'Die codex [S.] is eene copie van den eersten [V.], gemaakt (zonder twijfel op last van Bessarion) door een Graeculus, die heerlijk mooi schreef, en vrij sterk was in het ontcijferen van compendia, quibus horrent maxime Scholia, maar die bitter weinig Grieksch kende of liever gedachtenloos en als een ware ezel overschreef, zoodat die varianten bespottelijk zijn. (Brieven

<sup>1</sup> *i.e.* Venetus Marc. 475 usually known as G. Blaydes quotes it as S. Herwerden confuses his readers by quoting it sometimes as G. (*e.g.* in crit. notes on *ὑποθέσεις*) sometimes as S., sometimes as Ven. 475. He adds to the confusion by calling the Florentine Γ sometimes G. (notes on 682, 752, 948), and sometimes Q. (n. 700).

p. 328). Zacher, while admitting that it contains corrections from the interpolated Parisian group, holds as strongly to the opinion that it is a copy of V. After examining the MS. for a considerable time, I see no reason for rejecting this view. Where S. has a good reading, V. often has the reading, but has been wrongly reported by Bekker. [*e.g.* *Vesp.* 1107, V. also reads ξυλλεγόντες: *ibid.* 678 V has σὺ δὲ not σὺ δὲ γ': in *Pax* 932 λέγῃ is in V. I feel inclined to doubt Blaydes' report of S. in *Pax* 584 where he credits it with the good reading ἐδάμην for the corrupt ἐδάμη-<sup>ο</sup>μεν]. Nearly all the variants which H. quotes in his excerpts from the Scholia as due to S. will be found to resolve themselves either into readings which are actually in V. but have been wrongly reported or else into misreadings of what V. gives. Instances of the former may be found in H.'s notes *passim*. I will merely quote l. 870 where V. has the note ἐς τὸ ὄχε<sup>ο</sup>ν etc. as well as S., and l. 890 where V. also contains the words μονομαχοῦντι τὴν ἀρχήν. A striking instance of the ignorant blundering of the scribe of S. in copying V. is to be seen in note on l. 735. Here H. prints, παράβασιν ἐκάλουν ἀπὸ τοῦ παραβαίνειν τὸν χορὸν ἀπὸ τῆς νενομισμένης <κομματικῆς> addit Ven. 475 > στάσεως κτ<sup>ε</sup>. On turning to V. it is quite clear what has happened. The scribe of V. has written in the left hand margin against 729, where the chorus begins, κομμα(τιον) χο(ροῦ) [see also in R.]. This projects into the marginal scholia and comes between the line of the note which ends with νενομισμένης and the line beginning with στάσεως. The scribe of S. has read the word as κομματικῆς and as part of the scholion.

I think that what I have said will show that there are errors in the critical treatment of the text and scholia. The introduction to the book contains a useful summary of what is known or conjectured about the play. Perhaps undue prominence is given to a refutation of Paley's views about the scenic arrangements. The commentary is certainly too long and contains many notes on the usage of compound words in Aristophanes that anybody could construct for himself with the aid of Caravella's vocabulary.

I should like to take the opportunity of suggesting two alterations in the text of the play which have occurred to me.

ἐξεφύσσηεν τοσοῦτον πάλμον ὥστε τῷ  
καπνῷ  
πάντας Ἑλλήνας δακρῶσαι, τοὺς τ' ἐκεῖ  
τοὺς τ' ἐνθάδε.

612. ὡς δ' ἅπαξ τὸ πρῶτον ἄκουσ'† ἐψόφησεν  
ἀμπελος...  
οὐκέτ' ἦν οὐδεὶς ὁ παύσων, ἦδε δ' ἠφανί-  
ζετο.

612. ἄκουσ'] codd. except *Parisinus* B which  
has ἤκουσ'.  
ἤχοῦσ' Fl. Christianus. *τμηθεῖσ'* Reiske.  
ἡβῶσ' S. Widman.  
ἀφθεῖς Blaydes, (adopted by Her-  
werden.)

All these proposals depart too far from the reading in the manuscripts to explain the corruption satisfactorily. All assume that ἄκουσ' is the only corrupt word in the line. The only scholar who has suspected that the corruption has gone further is Richter who proposed ὡς δὲ πῦξ τὰ πρῶτα πληγείσ' or ὡς δὲ π. τὸ πρῶτον ἀλγοῦσ' 'inepte' according to Blaydes who adds 'sine causa in ὡς ἅπαξ τὸ πρῶτον offendit.' R.'s conjectures were hardly felicitous, but I think he was rightly 'offended' with the phrase ὡς ἀπ. τὸ πρῶτον, which seems as intolerable in Greek as 'when once for the first time' would be in English. I can find no closer parallel to it than the fragment of Sophocles quoted in Plutarch *Q.C.* p. 732 D, ἅπαντα τὰ γένητα <τὰ γένη τοῦ codd.> πρῶτον ἦλθ' <ἦλθεν codd.> ἅπαξ. Believing τὸ πρῶτον to be corrupt I should like to suggest that the line be read

ὡς δ' ἅπαξ τὸ πῦρ ἀκούουσ' (or ἀκούσας')  
ἐψόφησεν ἀμπ.

In V. τὸ πρῶτον is usually written τὸ πρ + and more often than not the + is written above the line. A careless or ignorant scribe could easily mistake τὸ πῦρ for this compendium of τὸ πρῶτον, especially as in such handwriting as that of the scribe of the Venetus the letter *v* is so closely looped into the letter following that *πρ* and *πῦρ* are often hardly distinguishable.

The corruption of ἀκούουσ' or ἀκούσας' to ἄκουσ' will on this view be the result of an ignorant attempt to mend the metre. With this alteration the line becomes as natural as *Acharn.* 923 κείπερ λάβοιτο τῶν νέων τὸ πῦρ ἅπαξ.

In 871 *sq.* I should like to suggest an alteration in the *personae* so that the passage should read,

TPYT. ἴθι νῦν ἀποδῶμεν τῇδε τὴν Θεωρίαν  
ἀνύσαντε τῇ βούλῃ—OIK. τίς αὐτῇ;  
(Dobree)

<TPYT.> τί φῆς;  
αὐτῇ Θεωρία 'στιν. <OIK.> ἦν ἡμείς  
ποτε  
ἐπαίομεν Βραυρωνάδ' ὑποπεπωκότες;

F. W. HALL.

#### SCHOEMANN—LIPSIUS' GREEK ANTIQUITIES.

*Griechische Alterthümer* von G. F. SCHOEMANN,  
vierte Auflage neu bearbeitet von J. H.  
Lipsius. Erster Band; Das Staatswesen.  
Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.  
1897. 12 M.

THIS book is a worthy product of an age of re-editing, of a generation which seeks to save great scientific works from becoming partially obsolete. This process is, for obvious reasons, more necessary in Greek Constitutional History than in most kindred subjects; and all who value Schömann will be thankful that this service has been performed, and should be grateful that it has been entrusted to the hands which produced the second edition of the *Attische Process*. But the problem of re-editing was not quite the same in the two cases. The *Griechische Alterthümer* was a work of a more literary and in the best sense 'popular' character, and it required larger additions

to be made to it—additions which could not well be specified by the sometimes convenient square brackets; hence the alterations in the present work have been incorporated in the text, and the notes have been fused with those of the original author. Only those who have attempted to bring a book 'up to date' know how difficult it is to secure uniformity of style in such a case. This task the editor has most successfully accomplished; the new matter has been skilfully interwoven with the old, and the occasional inequalities observable in the work are due to the fact that re-writing has been indulged in only where it was absolutely necessary. Some of the earlier portions of the book which deal with the general political development of Greece give the impression of not always containing the newest information. An editor may afford to neglect the passing vagaries of the archaeologist, interpreter and emender; but

fresh sources of positive information might have been referred to in notes and appendices. The latter might have been placed at the end of the work and consequently the editor's statement that the first sixteen sheets of the book were in print as early as 1891 furnishes no reason for a treatment of the connection of Greece with the East from sources almost purely mythological and linguistic (pp. 10 ff.), for touching on the art of Homeric times without any reference to its probable prototype (p. 73 ff.), or for discussing the antiquity of writing in the Greek world without any appeal to the startling discoveries of recent years (p. 16). The occasional need of appendices is still more observable in the later portion of the work. As an instance we may cite the treatment of the Draconian constitution, which is drawn from the *Athenaion Politeia*. The editor accepts it in its entirety (p. 339); in a short note he regards it as an afterthought of Aristotle's but as one whose details are sufficiently credible to be inserted without qualification in Schömann's text. Nowhere, however, is there any indication of the reasons for the controversy that has gathered round this suspicious chapter. Occasionally the brevity of the notes makes the editor's reasoning extremely difficult to follow. The discussion of the Athenian *Strategi* (p. 457) is a case in point. The view is adopted that the Athenians sometimes violated their constitution by appointing one 'member of the *collegium*' (presumably, therefore, after election) as its head. Yet the editor employs Beloch's instances, which show several cases of one tribe producing two *strategi*, as a proof that there was no election ἐξ ἀπάντων. If the occasional head was chosen ἐξ ἀπάντων, then these instances are intelligible; they are incomprehensible if he was a member of a *collegium* chosen in the ordinary tribal way. But, apart from such trifling obscurities, which may be merely the result of undue reticence, the work is, so far as I am able to judge, extremely clear and accurate. The only inconsistency which I have observed is the treatment of Draco as merely a codifier in the early portion of the treatise (p. 163), while his πολιτεία is discussed in the later; the only slip (one present in Schömann's third edition of 1871), the attribution of Teleclus' conquest of Geronthrae to the strange date *circa* 700 B.C. (p. 208). The description of the reforming King of Sparta as Agis III. (p. 301) is not quite accurate unless one adds 'of the Eurypontid house.'

The portions of Schömann's work which have attracted most attention and which—although in my opinion they yield in point of perfection to his account of Homeric society—have perhaps proved of most general utility, are the detailed descriptions of the constitutions of Sparta and Athens. Criticism of this new edition is hardly possible with respect to the first of these communities; for, although certain judicious amplifications have been introduced by the editor, I have not noticed any alteration of Schömann's views on the details of the Lacedaemonian polity. His description of Spartan social life is as excellent as before, the constitution he sketches as mysterious as ever. The Kings still preside over the council and share with the Ephors the presidency of the assembly: while the Ephors themselves still wield vast coercive and executive powers unconnected with their dependence on the Gerousia and Apella. But, as a simplification of the Spartan constitution can rest only on conjecture, there is no solid basis for a criticism of views which give us scattered glimpses of uncoordinated powers as the only issue of the evidence available.

With Athens the case is different. One's chief attention is naturally attracted to the mode in which a great student of Athenian constitutional law has dealt with the *Athenaion Politeia*, and to the question how far he has felt himself at liberty to incorporate the information given by this treatise in what was one of the most authoritative accounts of the constitution of Athens. The secret is soon revealed, for the editor's faith in this treatise is unbounded. He accepts even the view that the prae-Solonian Areiopagus was composed of ex-Archons (p. 507); this body he dissociates from the Ephetae and (setting aside the evidence of Pollux) thinks that these judges never sat on the Hill. He holds to the number 6,000 for the dicasts of the fifth century (p. 518) and the sole concession that he makes to Fränkel's discovery is to reproduce Gilbert's view as to the modification in the constitution of these courts which was effected at, or shortly after, the archonship of Euclides. But, although too much faith may have been at times reposed in what professes to be history but is often reconstruction, the evidence is handled with great critical and literary skill, and it may be interesting—even in cases where the uncertainty is too great for criticism to be possible—to cite some of the editor's views on certain controverted points. Of the alternative accounts of the limitation of the Athenian



monarchy he thinks the Aristotelian theory of 'assessors' the more probable, and he holds that for the posts of Archon and Polemarch all the Eupatridae were from the first eligible (pp. 330 and 336). In treating of Draco's constitution he takes the view that the legislator gave active citizenship to those who could provide themselves with a panoply (p. 339). He does not discuss the moot question of the tense (*ἀπεδέδοτο*, *Ath. Pol.* 4); but, in spite of the form of the expression, he is probably right in his interpretation. The pluperfect implies the first and most fundamental of the changes; 'political rights had been given' to this class—before the other more detailed regulations treated in the chapter were realised. In § 2 of this fourth chapter he reads *διεγγῶν* and *δεχομένων* and thinks that the passage means that the (*ex*) *strategi*, *hipparchi* and *prytaneis* had to give a guarantee for their successors, each of the latter having to furnish a security of the same census. It is certainly a singular institution, for there is no evidence that the principal of nomination, which (according to the Roman expression *qui periculo suo nominat magistratum*) would seem to be the only justification for such responsibility, was recognised in the Draconian constitution. In the account of the limits within which the ostracised man might dwell (*Ath. Pol.* 22) it is refreshing to find *ἐνός* restored for *ἐκός* (p. 426). I have always felt that the motive for the regulation was the danger of communication between the individual ostracised and Persia; the government cared nothing how far West he went. In the account of the admission of classes to the archonship the undoubtedly correct view of the change bought about by Aristides' *psephisma* is adopted, viz. that the measure allowed the enrollment of movable property in the census (p. 356). Less certain is the view that it was Aristides who admitted the *hippeis* to the archonship and the *thetes* to the boule; for these changes are less implicitly contained in Plutarch's version of that statesman's measure. But the latter admission would have accorded well with the circumstances of the decree. In the treatment of the revolution of 411 (p. 361) the 5,000 of *Ath. Pol.* 30, who actually appear for a moment on the scene, seem to be identified with the same number which was to be chosen as the privileged class (c. 29), whereas they must have borne a greater resemblance (as Dr. Kenyon and Dr. Sandys have remarked) to οἱ πεντακισχίλιοι οἱ ἐκ τῶν ὀπλῶν of c. 33.

In dealing with recent speculations on points of Athenian history the editor is judiciously conservative. The Asiatic origin of the Ionians, whether as a race or as an aggregate of mixed elements, finds no favour in his eyes, and he will not even derive these late arrivals at Athens—the names of the Ionic *phylae*—from an eastern source (pp. 328–329). It is strange, however, that he should have stated as a fact the extremely probable but quite unprovable hypothesis that the γένη of Athens were composed only of Eupatridae, the Geomori and Demiurgi being outside the clans (pp. 334 and 339). But his most remarkable abandonment of traditional views is found in his acceptance of Wilamowitz's idea that the *δωβελία* introduced by Cleophon was a gigantic pension scheme giving each Athenian two obols a day (pp. 358 and 477). It may at once be granted that, as two obols were paid by the state at Athens for very different purposes, the word *δωβελία* has no certain and constant signification. But the least probable of all its meanings is a payment which, as Beloch has shown (*Griech. Gesch.* ii. p. 77), would, on the most modest computation of the number of recipients, have come to 240 talents a year. By the side of such a sum the 16 talents, 47 minae and 87 drachmae spent on the *δωβελία* in the four prytaneis of 410 B.C. (C. I. A. I. n. 188) would have been a mere trifle. No mention is made, in this connection, of the mystical *δωβελία* 'Ἀθηναῖαι Νίκαι of three years' later (C. I. A. I. n. 189 a); yet, if that contested reading is correct, we should naturally understand, by this *δωβελία* at least, a dole for sacred purposes. Beloch's view, that the two obols of the former year were, in the main, jury-pay, is not in itself improbable: for, after the fall of the Four Hundred or of the succeeding government of the Five Thousand, payment may have been made to the dicasts at this rate; but what renders this interpretation of the passage in the *Ath. Pol.* (c. 28) unlikely is that 'the *δωβελία* now first introduced' is described without any explanation or qualification whatever, as though it were something still in force at the time when the treatise was written; yet the jury-pay of this period was three obols (c. 62). The *δωβελία*, too, of Aristotle's *Politics* (ii, 7, 19), which is adopted as a means of equalising property and which leads its unworthy recipients to demand still more, rather tends to show that, when the Aristotelian school used this word without qualification, they were thinking of the theoric fund. A. H. J. GREENIDGE.

## MANITIUS' EDITION OF HIPPARCHUS.

*'Hipparchi in Arati et Eudoxi Phaenomena Commentariorum Libri Tres'* ad Codicum Fidem recensuit Germanica Interpretatione et Commentariis instruxit CAROLUS MANITIUS. Lipsiae, in Aedibus B. G. Teubneri. 1894. 4 M.

THIS is an admirable edition of a book which has waited long for its editor. The Commentary of Hipparchus on Aratus claims our attention for many other reasons than because, out of all the works of the great astronomer it alone survives, preserved in the irony of fate by its connection with a third-rate poem. It is interesting as a fine and early specimen of polemical writing, his demolition of the older commentator Attalus showing that Hipparchus not only, as Ptolemy says of him, loved toil and truth, but also delighted in controversy with a zest not unknown to modern science. It has some bearing on the literary, as well as the scientific culture of its day; and the passage in which Hipparchus decides between the two readings, δὲ πλᾶτέες and δ' ἀπλᾶτέες, is remarkable not only astronomically but because the common reading, known to a later scholiast, is neither one nor the other, but ἀπλανεές. It has still an interest not purely archaeological for the astronomer; no one for instance, who knows that the star  $\theta$  Ursae Majoris is ranked to-day among those with an extraordinarily large proper motion can fail to be struck by the remark of Herr Manitius that its position, as given by Hipparchus, appears to be wrong, while those of the stars culminating with it are right. And startling at least is his suggestion that a star in Cassiopeia, called 'bright,' which can hardly be identified with any now visible to the naked eye in that constellation may actually be the famous 'new star' of 1572, which to-day is perceptible only with the aid of a telescope. If so, it had disappeared by the time of Ptolemy. But of course the work is valuable chiefly to the student of astronomical history in general, and of uranography in particular—how valuable may best be seen by applying some of the facts contained in it to the theories of those who have attempted to do without it. No one who has really studied it will have any difficulty, for instance, in appreciating at its true worth such an attempt as Mr. Robert Brown made, a few years back, before the Congress of Oriental-

ists, to find a Chaldaean date for the globe of Eudoxus.

The excellent preliminary essay of Herr Manitius on the MSS. of Hipparchus is in Latin, as are also the footnotes referring to the text, and the several indices, while the translation and the explanatory notes are in German. His edition of the text seems to me in all respects satisfactory. A work in which many words, such as the zodiacal names, are constantly recurring at short intervals, gives every excuse to the copyist for occasionally missing out a line or two: on the other hand the context generally makes it clear how the gap thus created is to be filled up, and indeed what look at first sight like audacious interpolations by Herr Manitius turn out on examination to be merely the actual words of Hipparchus introduced from corresponding passages in other parts of the book.

Of the German translation little more need be said—except so far as the identification of stars is concerned—than that it is clear, and will be found helpful in the few cases where the Greek of Hipparchus presents any difficulty. But one complaint must be made against Herr Manitius, and that is for his systematic use of the word 'Mondbreite' to translate the ἡμιπῆχιον which Hipparchus employs to measure small angular distances, as those of culminating stars just east or west of the meridian. His argument is that a 'cubit,' which he takes as equal to two degrees—more exactly, as Schjellerup and Epping have shown, it was two degrees and a third—contained twenty-four "digits," twelve of which were supposed to measure the apparent diameter of the moon. It is indeed highly probable that the Babylonian inventors of this measure made the natural, and at first almost inevitable, mistake of overestimating the apparent size of moon and sun. But it is surely an injustice to Hipparchus, who knew as well as we that the real breadth of the moon is only about half a degree, to represent him as continually using an expression which would imply that he took it to be a whole degree.

With the aid of a globe adjusted to suit the age of Hipparchus, Herr Manitius has attempted the identification of every star, the rising, setting, or culmination of which is given in the book. Many of his results are highly interesting. To take two instances only, it appears clearly that the bright star

placed by the Greeks and Arabs at the end of Eridanus is not, as M. Flammarion, and even so careful a student as Schjellerup, have supposed, the modern  $\alpha$  Eridani or Achernar—a southerly star far below the horizon of Rhodes, or even of Alexandria—but certainly, as Ideler discerned and as even Halley rightly conjectured, the third magnitude star now marked in our maps as  $\theta$  Eridani. To anyone who will carefully compare the evidence of Hipparchus, Ptolemy, Al Sufi and Ulugh Beg, the execution of Charles I. will not appear more certain than that this now feeble luminary was seen by the ancients as a first magnitude star. Again, it comes out that the bright star placed by Hipparchus and the pseudo-Eratosthenes in the forefeet of the Ram—where there are now no stars at all—is not, as Biot would have it,  $\alpha$  Arietis, but the star  $\eta$  Piscium, which Ptolemy and all his successors place in the Fishes. It is, perhaps, worth notice that in the Babylonian tablets of the Greek period, translated by Epping and Strassmaier, this star belongs to a different group from those of our Aries. As to the three stars by whose aid Hipparchus indicates the place of the north pole for his time, I cannot doubt that Ideler was right in seeking them among the very small stars at the back of the Little Bear, perhaps the same as those in the catalogue of Heis, supposed by Herr Manitius in the notes. Had they been those bright stars of the Dragon and the Little Bear, supposed by him in the text, Hipparchus would surely have indicated them, in his usual way, by their places in the constellations.

Excellent as are the notes and observations at the end of the volume, they contain some statements which I think should not be allowed to pass unquestioned. Herr Manitius is no doubt right in pointing out that the commentary of Aratus cannot, as has been thought, be the very earliest work of Hipparchus, who actually alludes, in the course of it, to a former book which implies a great deal of previous labour. The most we are justified in saying is that it was written before its author had begun to suspect the precession of the equinoxes, but Herr Manitius seems to me wholly mistaken in assigning the year 134 B.C. as the earliest in which this suspicion can be supposed to have occurred to him. Pliny says that Hipparchus was induced to make his great catalogue of stars by a new and strange celestial phenomenon which convinced him that the heavens were not unchangeable;

and this story, wholly discredited without reason by Delambre, is generally held to be confirmed by the record in the Chinese annals of a new star seen in 134. Accepting it, Herr Manitius proceeds to construct history out of it after this fashion. The new star's appearance, he says, led to the cataloguing, the cataloguing led to the famous discovery that the star Spica had changed its place since the time of Timocharis, this discovery led to the recognition of precession, this to that of the distinction between the tropical and sidereal years, and so on. I do not hesitate to say that, plausible as all this sounds, it is not history, nor even beyond the reach of contradiction. Without disputing Pliny's story, I cannot but think that Ptolemy, a far better authority than Pliny, has shown ample reason why Hipparchus, who divined the precessional movement, and suspected the proper motions of the 'fixed' stars, should have undertaken his catalogue even without the additional incentive of the new star, which very likely would be the only one that Pliny could understand. And it seems to me hardly possible to read the third and seventh books of the *Almagest* without coming to the conclusion that much of the work assigned by Herr Manitius to the years after 134 must have been at least begun before, especially if, as is generally supposed, Hipparchus died about 125. Admitting that the catalogue of stars came towards the end of his labours, I would observe that by fixing the positions of the small stars which had never been catalogued before, Hipparchus might teach the law of precession to posterity, but could not learn it himself. He must have derived it from those conspicuous stars whose places had been already determined, and we know as a fact that he had taken the longitude of Spica as early as 146. Again, he justified his new measure of the tropical year by a comparison of a solstice observed in 280 by Aristarchus with one observed in 135 by himself; and that this latter observation was made for the express purpose of comparison is probable, because we know that he thought it impossible to obtain the hour of a solstice with accuracy, and relied in general on his observations of equinoxes. We are told moreover that his detection of the difference between the tropical and sidereal years threw him into perplexity; which it could hardly have done had he already clearly recognised the precession of the equinoxes, since the latter phenomenon gives the explanation of the former.

After an interesting examination of the

various epithets—*λαμπροί, ἐκφανείς, ἀμυνοί*,—applied to particular stars in this book. Herr Manitius concludes that as yet Hipparchus knew nothing of the classification of the fixed stars by magnitudes 'as he applied it in his catalogue and as it is transmitted to us by Ptolemy.' I should like to point out that, however probable, it is not really certain that the familiar division of the stars into six magnitudes goes back to Hipparchus. We know indeed that he classed them according to their lustre, but we do not know how. And if Herr Manitius means to imply that the magnitudes in Ptolemy's catalogue are simply copied from that of Hipparchus, this, however confidently M. Flammarion may assume it, is only an assumption. There is even some evidence to the contrary. Hipparchus says in this work that to him the brightest star in the Little Bear was that at the end of the tail, which is our present pole-star, *α Ursae Minoris*. Now Ptolemy, as is well known, ranks this star a whole magnitude lower than  $\beta$  in the same group, which indeed, as the younger Herschel remarked, is variable.

Herr Manitius, following Delambre, makes Hipparchus the inventor of trigonometry, which certainly he employed, and which certainly cannot be much older

than he. M. Tannery has recently tried to deprive him of this glory, partly on the strength of a passage in Theon of Smyrna, which seems to me of little or no importance, but also on the general ground that if we attribute more to Hipparchus than we must, we raise him to a stature something more than human. Indeed the work which we cannot help ascribing to him would seem enough to have fully occupied him during the whole of his laborious days—and nights.

Herr Manitius is not the first commentator to find out that in one or two cases Hipparchus has misunderstood Eudoxus. It may be so, and looks as if it were so; but on the whole I must incline to the opinion of Delambre that Hipparchus probably knew more of Eudoxus than we, who indeed derive our knowledge of him in these matters from those passages only which Hipparchus happens to quote. However if there may be two opinions about the soundness of one or two of the theories held by Herr Manitius, there can be only one as to the excellence and utility of his work. He would be entitled to deep gratitude if he had given us nothing more than his admirable astronomical index.

E. J. WEBB.

#### ERMATINGER'S *ATTISCHE AUTOCHTHONENSAGE*.

*Die attische Autochthonensage bis auf Euripides*, mit einer einleitenden Darstellung der Bedeutung und Entwicklung der Attischen Sage bis auf Euripides—von EMIL ERMATINGER. Berlin: Mayer and Müller, 1897. M. 3. 60.

In the preface to his valuable monograph, Herr Emil Ermatinger draws attention to a point of interest beyond the immediate sphere of mythology. The influence, nay the supremacy of Athens over the rest of Greece in the fifth century B.C., is, in the departments of politics, literature, and art, a common-place of criticism, but hitherto no serious attention has been paid to the progress *pari passu* of a like influence in the development of mythology. Mythology is the main subject matter of Greek literature and Greek art, it was by no means without influence on Greek politics. It is really impossible to grasp fully the influence of Athens in politics, art, and literature with-

out some comprehension of the fashion in which she absorbed, moulded, selected and rejected mythical material. Slowly, very slowly, in England we are beginning to realise that mythology is a factor in classical scholarship worthy of serious attention, and the present monograph, dealing as it does especially with the relation of the mythology of Euripides calls for detailed attention.

The monograph falls into five sections, any one of which is fairly complete in itself. In the preface the general programme is set forth in a sketch of the development of Attic saga up to the time of Euripides; the first chapter deals in detail with the special myth of Erichthonios, Erechtheus again up to the time of Euripides; the second treats the figure of Erichthonios in the drama of Euripides, the third of the actual lost drama of Erechtheus and mythical basis, the fourth is devoted to the saga of Ion.

Passing in review in the preface the general history of the development of Attic



saga in general, Herr Ermatinger notes, as every one has noted, the paucity of Attic myth in Homer, but he is strongly averse, and on this point we are heartily with him, to the practice, too fashionable, of explaining every allusion to Attic mythology as an 'interpolation.' If an interpolation is supposed, strong motive for it must be shown. Now, *e.g.*, the Attic hero Menestheus is mentioned *Il.* ii. 352, iv. 327, xii. 331. What possible reason can be alleged for his interpolation? Post-Homeric mythology knows of him as the foe and oppressor of the later Athenian favourite, Theseus—why put the halo of Homer about his head? Motive for suppression is obvious, for interpolation, none that we know of. With Menestheus are named the Athenians, Stichios, Pheidias, and Bias—in later Attic mythology they play no part—the better evidence of their reality, no one would trouble to interpolate these dead heads.

In the 'epic cycle' there is a marked increase of Athenian mythology. Herr Ermatinger gives throughout a careful detailed enumeration of instances, and this in itself makes his book a valuable corpus of references. He goes on through the lyrists, logographers, historians, Attic comedy, works of art, described or extant, and finally arrives at the tragedians. In the Aeschylean *τεράχη τῶν Ὀμήρου μεγάλων δειπνῶν* Attic mythology plays, as was natural, but a modest part. There is something like a reaction to Trojan, Theban, Argive, Argonautic material. All that we can certainly collect is, the Alope of Choriclos, the Satyric Kerkyon of Aeschylus, two kindred myths. In the Eleusiniacs of Aeschylus, Theseus is introduced to rescue the bodies of the Seven; Aeschylus wrote an *Oreithyia*; the Eumenides is concerned in great part with local mythology, and the Salaminian Women is approximately patriotic. The mention of these lost plays recalls to us, what indeed throughout the book is very sensible, *i.e.* how sadly fragmentary is our evidence, how different might our attitude towards particular myths have been, how altered the perspective of our outlook, had we possessed say the *Ἦραι ἢ Ἐρεχθεύς* of Aristophanes or the *Oreithyia* of Aeschylus. Still the fact remains that for Aeschylus, out of eighty extant titles, six only are of Attic significance. By the time of Sophocles there is a marked advance. Out of 100 titles we have sixteen that are Attic. The cause may be three-fold. Something must be allowed for exhaustion of material, much for the development of

Athenian patriotism. Something, again, for the influence of the younger contemporary of Sophocles, the innovator Euripides. With Euripides, according to Herr Ermatinger, culminates the *οὐκ ἄνευγε* *Θησέως* tendency, and for Theseus we may write also Erechtheus. There is an outburst of autochthonic sentiment. Theseus interpolates himself into Theban, Trojan, Argive, Argonautic sagas, he absorbs Heracles, and effaces him on his own ground in combats with Amazons and Lapiths. Everywhere Athene is champion and protector of the oppressed; from distant lands the cry is heard

τὰν κλεινὰν εἰθ' ἔλθοιμεν  
Θησέως εὐδαίμονα χώραν.

If they may not reach this Mecca in life all fugitives are fain to lay their bones there in death.

In the first, perhaps the most valuable chapter, the author is brought face to face with the crucial question, Are Erichthonios and Erechtheus two or one? On this vexed question he throws much light. In a tabular view we are presented with the various myths with which either or both names are connected, and the general conclusion, unquestionably sound, is that the personalities were originally identical and gradually differentiated. The distinction was emphasized, but by no means invented by Euripides. By the time of the Corneto vase the separation was so complete that the child Erichthonios and the grown man Erechtheus can be represented side by side on the same vase. As regards the derivation of the name, Herr Ermatinger rejects the popular notion that *Ἐρεχθεύς* is connected with the word *ἐρέχθω* in the sense of rending, tearing, as in *ἀλλεσι θυρὸν ἐρέχθων* (*Od.* v. 83, 157), and believes that both names alike start from the idea of *χθών* strengthened by *ἐρι*. This does not imply an 'agrarian deity,' but simply an autochthonic one. This may not be capable of philological demonstration, it certainly is consistent with the mythological content of Erechtheus-Erichthonios. It also receives incidental confirmation from the fact that Erichthonios is a title of Hermes, the chthonic god (*Et. Mag.* 371, 51.) The conclusion arrived at by Herr Ermatinger as to the original identity and gradual differentiation of the two personalities is substantially the same as that of the present reviewer (*Myth and Man, Ancient Athens*, xlvii.-xlix.), only supported by far wider learning and more cogent reasoning.

In a book throughout admirable in its fulness we may note some small blemishes. First and foremost it is remarkable to find any one now-a-days discussing the Ion who has apparently never even heard of Dr. Verrall. The amazing indifference in some English minds to what is done in Germany is not often paralleled by the like ignorance in German scholars. It is time this chauvinism ceased. Herr Ermatinger, like Dr. Verrall, sees in the Ion a 'tendenz' drama, 'alle diese Stellen finden keine genügende Erklärung wenn man nicht aus dem Rahmen des Stückes hinausgeht und eine Tendenz der Dichter's annimmt.' He also sees clearly enough that this tendency is not 'all glory to Apollo.' 'Für Euripides haben eben die Orakel ihre Heiligkeit verloren.' 'Apollo bleibt doch um nichts weniger ein Betrug' 'in Wahrheit aber hat Euripides mit dem Volksaberglauben längst gebrochen' (p. 133), but the tendency he sees is an intense patriotism, a paean of autochthonism. It is worth considering whether this did not go some way towards palliating the 'swinging fallacy of the goddess in the machine.' We should like incidentally to indicate a third possible tendency, the glorification of Apollo as *Patroos*, the patronymic god; here as in the Eumenides paternity with patriarchy covers a multitude of sins, as the Eumenides themselves bitterly felt.

Another point, Herr Ermatinger is not so strong in archaeological as in literary evidence. Dr. Dörpfeld has identified the scene of the Creousan rape, τὰ θεοῦ τὰ φίλτατα,

with the ancient Pythion mentioned Thucyd. ii. 15, 4. The identification, demonstrated to our minds beyond the shadow of a doubt, rests of course on complex archaeological evidence given fully in the *Mittheilungen*. Herr Ermatinger says 'diese Annahme wird durch die Darstellung des Euripideischen Ion direkt widerlegt,' and this simply because Euripides says the scene took place in the Πᾶνς θασίμα, a vague appellation for the whole district. If Dr. Dörpfeld is wrong it is not by this sort of argument that his conclusions will be upset. We feel, too, a certain archaeological weakness at times in the discussion of vase-paintings; this weakness comes out in the space given (pp. 125, 126) to the discussion of vases in connection with the Ion saga that have manifestly no bearing on it. Herr Ermatinger knows this, but he seems afraid to leave them out; he does not venture to omit opinions on the matter, now quite out of date, of Welcker Gerhard or Rochette. On the other hand, he completely omits the remarkable and beautiful 'Erichthonios' vase in the British Museum published by Dr. Murray (*J.H.S.* Pl. lxxii. 111.) The design is somewhat enigmatic, but the interpretation supported on it by Drs. Murray and Hartwig well deserves discussion. These are minor blemishes in a valuable and admirable book. Herr Ermatinger's name is unknown to us, but we hope this is only a prolegomenon to further mythological work.

JANE E. HARRISON.

#### JUNG'S GEOGRAPHY OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

*Grundriss der Geographie von Italien und dem orbis Romanus*, von JULIUS JUNG. Zweite umgearbeitete und vermehrte Auflage. München, Berk, 1897. Svo. Pp. 178. 3 Mk. 50.

BIBLIOGRAPHICALLY this book is the first 'Hälfte' of the third 'Abteilung' of the third 'Band' of the well-known *Handbook* edited by Dr. Iwan von Müller. Practically it is a concise, lucid, and learned account of the Roman world from a geographical and statistical standpoint. The matter is well-selected and clearly put: the references to special treatises are copious and the book as a whole likely to be extremely useful to

students of the Roman empire. It can be bought as an independent work, with its own title page and index. As it will no doubt pass in due course into a third edition, I may perhaps venture to criticise one section which seems to me not to reach the general level of excellence distinguishing the book as a whole. I refer to the five pages devoted to Britain. There is a good deal in these few pages to which exception may reasonably be taken. The sketch of the Roman conquest of the island is not very clear and not very correct, or perhaps I should say in connexion with a difficult subject, not very probable. Thus there is absolutely no reason to think that, as Dr.

Jung says, the Roman invasion had its earliest centres in Winchester and Silchester and there are strong reasons for thinking the reverse. There is no reason to think that Chester was first occupied by Suetonius, or that Agricola built a line of forts, garrisoned by legionary vexillations, between the Wear and the Solway: such a line would be marvellous, even geographically. Again, the section on the towns of the province needs correction. Chester, so far as we know, was certainly not a *colonia*. It is wrong to say that English place names ending in -cester, -chester, or the like, invariably denote Roman settlements. There is no evidence, again, nor any probability that many river names lost their Celtic appellations and came to be called after towns on their banks, or that the many rivers called Colne are traces of towns styled or styling themselves *coloniae*. The literature of the subject again is inadequately given. Not to criticize further, it

appears unfortunately true that here, as in so many German books, the antiquities of our island are unsatisfactorily treated and imperfectly known to the author. I should not dream of suggesting that this lapse relating to Britain damages the general excellence of the book. Britain was not, in most ways, an important province: the space allotted to it by Dr. Jung is naturally and rightly a small space, and the defects which it contains are therefore confined within narrow limits. But the book will, no doubt, reach a third edition, and in an English review it may be permissible to notice what concerns things English (or British) and to suggest some corrections. The rest of the book, as I have said, appears to me to be well done, and its contents to be both accurate and adequate, such as one would expect from a scholar who has done previously such good work as Dr. Jung.

F. HAVERFIELD.

#### JANNARIS'S HISTORICAL GREEK GRAMMAR.

*Historical Greek Grammar* by A. N. JANNARIS, Ph. D., Lecturer on Post-classical and Modern Greek at the University of St. Andrews. Macmillan. 1897. 25s. net.

THIS is a book which should be in the hands of every one who is interested in the study of later Greek. The object of the writer, as stated in p. x., is to show 'how much of ancient Greek is still surviving in modern Greek, and how much has become extinct, and to indicate the period, cause, process and other attendant circumstances of such a loss or change.' To give precision to his statements he distinguishes seven periods in the development of the language: A. Classical, from B.C. 500 to 300; H. Hellenistic, from B.C. 300 to 150; G. Greco-Roman, from B.C. 150 to A.D. 300; T. Transitional, from A.D. 300 to 600; B. Byzantine, from A.D. 600 to 1000; M. Mediaeval, from A.D. 1000 to 1450; N. Neo-hellenic, A.D. 1450 to the present time.

The book, which is closely printed in small type, and would have easily filled 1000 pages of ordinary type, is made up as follows: Preface, Contents, very full Bibliography, pp. i.-xxxviii; Introduction and Phonology, pp. 1-101; Morphology, 101-

311; Syntax, 312-504; Appendices on Accent, Quantity, Terminal Consonantism, Future Indicative, the Moods, especially the Infinitive in later Greek, pp. 507-580; Indices, pp. 581-737. The two things which to my mind constitute the special interest and value of the book, are (1) the abundant examples of post-classical forms and uses, and (2) the explanations given of etymological and syntactical growth and decay. The following may be taken as average specimens (slightly abbreviated) of the latter. P. 106 (on the progressive simplification of the Greek declension) 'besides the presence of an identical genitive plural -ων in all declensions, the first and third declensions generally had in the accusative—the most familiar of all cases—the common ending -ας. This coincidence led in the post-classical period to a confusion between them. Such an interchange was to be expected, since, with the retreat of the dative there remained only one varying case, the nominative, which ended in -αι (for the first declension) or -ες (for the third declension). The homophony of αι and ε was in itself suggestive, and the question at issue was, which of the two forms should prevail over the other. It was naturally -ες, since this ending was far commoner, and had also the

advantage of a sibilant close (-ς), a sound very popular owing to its presence in most of the other plural cases. Thus we find *γεννάδες, Πίστες*, etc. in the Transitional Period, and the change is completed by the end of the Byzantine period. P. 504 f. 'the history of the participle affords a parallel to that of the infinitive. As the latter was foredoomed to extinction in consequence of its indefiniteness and want of inflexion, so the participle, in particular the class termed adverbial or circumstantial, did not appeal to popular taste and needs because of its ambiguity and inconvenient inflexion. For apart from its vagueness in regard to person, it did not even specify its own nature and meaning, but subordinated it to the context. Thus λέγων could mean *saying, who says or said, if he says or said, by saying, in order to say*, etc. To avoid such ambiguities, as well as the mental strain involved by the frequent use of participles, even the classical writers, though fond of a participial construction, often resorted to the expedient of a lengthy but clearer and easier analysis into a subordinate clause, introduced by *εἰ ἐπεὶ ὅς ὅτι* etc. Hence in the Greco-Roman period the place of participles is mostly taken by finite verbs with subordinating particles or coordinating conjunction; and even the more careful and scholarly writers who still affect its use, frequently blunder in their way of using it.'

In p. vii. Dr. Jannaris says that his original plan was to adhere as much as possible to the methods and theories generally received in our leading grammars, adopting even the Erasmian pronunciation (to which he had become a convert when an undergraduate in German Universities), but that he had not advanced far in his research when he began to light on phenomena which would not fit in with the received theories. He became convinced that the true grammar of the Greek language had yet to be written; and particularly blames the conventional grammar of the Western School for doing away with 'the traditional pronunciation, which reflects perhaps the least changed part of the language.' Hence we find him in the section on Phonology maintaining against Blass and Conway, the conclusion that the English *e* represents the true pronunciation of the sonants *η, ι, υ, ει, οι, υι*.

What has been said will be enough to show the general character of the book. Among the innovations on conventional grammar mentioned in the last paragraph may be noted the transference of the subjunctive and imperative from the aorist to

the future. The old classification is, he says, misleading, since from a logical and syntactical point of view we cannot well conceive a past subjunctive and past imperative, such moods, owing to the nature of their special case, always referring to the future (p. 179). Accordingly in p. 555 we find λάβω, ληφθῶ, ἀναβῆ, κατενέγκης, ἀντείπῃ classed as future subjunctives. Still more extraordinary is the suggestion in p. 434, that καταφθείρω in Gen. 6, 13 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ καταφθείρω αὐτοὺς, is fut. subj. Is he not here falling into the same fault which he condemns in the authors of our traditional grammar, and disregarding the fact of morphological connection to suit a preconceived theory? In p. 560 he confesses that the cardinal difference between the indicative mood and the subjunctive and imperative is that the former may refer to all three divisions of time, while the other two refer only to the future, and may therefore be called prospective moods. But if so why are not the *present* subjunctive and imperative also made over to the future tense? Again in p. 486 he allows that the aorist infinitive is often used where we might have expected the future infinitive, yet he does not therefore think it necessary to re-christen it as infinitive future. So far as my observation extends, he ignores the generally received characteristic of the aorist as expressing momentary action.

I go on to notice other points in which I am disposed to question the views propounded. P. 5, 'the colloquial or popular language has left, and could leave, no representative specimens to distant posterity.' The grounds for the assertion are given as follows: colloquial compositions, being of temporary and private character, have all perished in the humid soil of Greece; moreover every scribe in committing his thoughts to writing unconsciously rises to a literary style. But surely Plato and Aristophanes give us specimens, not perhaps of the pigeon-Greek of slaves, but of the ordinary colloquial Greek, just as our dramatists and novelists do of colloquial English. P. 8, 'Christianity originated in Asia Minor': is it then a myth that St. Paul was sent out by the Church of Antioch? P. 34, The Greek definition γραμματική ἐστὶν ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς καὶ συγγραφεύσιν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ λεγόμενων is translated 'grammar is the knowledge of the usual *subject matter* and diction found in the classical authors': surely τὰ λεγόμενα has nothing to do with the *subject-matter*. P. 101, 'By the end of the fourth century B.C., the dual had entirely



disappeared from the language': this is far too sweeping: the dual is not to be found in the N.T., but it is very common in such a writer as Clem. Al., cf. *Protr.* p. 1, § 1 ἀμφω μὲν ἦσθη ὁδικῶ ἰδ. p. 42 ἐγενέσθη καὶ ἄλλω τινὲ δύο Κρητικῶ ἀνδριανοποιῶ...τούτω δὲ τὰ ἐν Ἀργεὶ τοῖν Διοσκούροιον ἀγάλματα κατεσκευασμένην, also pp. 39, 55, 57, 62, *Paed.* i. p. 98, iii. 276, etc. P. 163, 'The forms *τον* and *τω* for *τινός* and *τινὶ* disappear from the Δ inscriptions about 300 B.C.' Since Δ stands for 'classical,' and the classical period (by definition) ends with 300 B.C., Δ has probably crept in by mistake. To prevent misunderstanding it should have been stated that these forms are found in literature at a much later period, e.g. in Clem. Al. we find ἄλλω τω p. 153, παντί τω 54 and 884. P. 165, § 598 on the particle *κάν* is misplaced. P. 185, 'No visible augment is taken by verbs beginning with ω': but reference is made just before, and in p. 189 to *ἴσθουν* and similar forms. P. 321, 'When relative pronouns came to be used for demonstratives (2038), the article naturally found a place before relatives also.' The examples given are such as τῶν ἅπερ ἠβούλεσθε. Turning to § 2038 we read 'the use of relatives in indirect questions brought them into association with the direct interrogatives, and thus rendered them admissible in questions also,' which is illustrated by οὗτος τί ποιεῖς; ὅτι ποῶ; This of course has nothing to do with the use of the article before a relative clause, and also fails to explain that the ὅτι in ὅτι ποῶ; retains its indirect force, implying '(do you ask) what I am doing'? P. 421, ἵνα is said to 'stand for modal ἄν' and is illustrated by three quotations from Epictetus, i. 29, 16 Σωκράτης ἵνα πάθῃ ταῦτα ἵπ' Ἀθηναίων; where Schw. translates *siccine Socrates tractari debuit?* understanding it as a brachylogy for εἰδει οἶν ἵνα; ii. 19, 21 ποῦ γὰρ ἵν' ὑμεῖς τὴν ἀρετὴν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἴσῃν ὑπολάβητε; which Schw. explains *ubi enim est ut revera vos existimetis?* i.e. *quomodo credam vos etc.*; iv. 1, 142 ἵνα τις...σοι τοῦτο μόνον εἴπῃ; which Schw. again explains by *utinam aliquis adstaret tibi!* No doubt these elliptical uses of ἵνα were partly suggested by the idiomatic uses of *ut*. I do not see that we should get any help in such sentences by the substitution of modal ἄν for ἵνα. P. 398 (repeated in p. 462), 'The monstrous construction ὑπερ ἐγώ in 2 Cor. 11, 23 rests on an itacistic misspelling for εἴπερ ἐγώ.' There is nothing monstrous in the construction, if taken in connection with the preceding words *διακονοὶ Χριστοῦ εἰσιν; ὑπερ* standing for *ὑπερ-διάκονος: εἴπερ* would

make no sense. P. 399, It might have been mentioned that ὡς in the sense of *πρός* was used with the *accusativus rei* in some later writers, cf. Clem. Al. *Protr.* p. 4 ὡς τὸν πρῶον μετὰ γων ἡμᾶς ζύγον, p. 6 προὔτρεπεν ὡς τὴν ἀλήθειαν. The daring correction of the text in the case of ὑπερ ἐγώ may be paralleled from p. 478, where the use of *εἰ* as a direct interrogative particle in biblical Greek (e.g. Acts 21, 37 *εἰ ἐξεστίν μοι εἰπεῖν τι πρὸς σε*; Matt. 12, 10 *εἰ ἐξεστὶν τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεύειν*;) is said to be based on an itacistic misspelling of the colloquial ἦ. Surely Dr. Jannaris cannot expect us to receive this simply on his *Ipse dixit*. The construction is exactly parallel to that of the pleonastic ὅτι with quotations. Is he able to point to any uncertainty in the reading *εἰ*? Looking through Geden's Lexicon I do not find a single various reading. Or is it the case that ἦ is commonly used as an interrogative particle in the N.T.? On the contrary it is never found. Yet Dr. Jannaris has such a predilection for this unused particle, that he substitutes it for the interrogative ἦ against both reason and MS. authority in Matt. 26, 53; Rom. 3, 29; 6, 3; 11, 2; 1 Cor. 6, 9; 14, 36; 2 Cor. 11, 7; 1 Th. 2, 19; Jas. 4, 5; and with a still bolder defiance of authority, substitutes ἦ μὴν (or ἡμὴν) for ἀμὴν, wherever the latter is found at the beginning of a sentence (cf. pp. 433 and 478). The double ἀμὴν he explains as due first to some Xtian reader who wrote ἀμὴν as an explanation of the obsolescent ἦ μὴν, and second to a second copyist who gave both words in the text, the corruption being completed by a third copyist. It is extraordinary that it should never have occurred to him to ask why this plague of copyists should have been confined to St. John's Gospel, in which alone the double ἀμὴν is found. But it is not merely in the phrase ἦ μὴν that the favourite μὴν finds admission into the N.T.: wherever our present text has οὐ μὴ we are told to replace it by οὐ μὴν (p. 433) (1) because μὴ is here inexplicable and οὐ μὴ cannot be reduced to any principle of the language, (2) because the sense requires everywhere an emphatic asseveration in the negative, such as οὐ μὴν bears in Soph. *El.* 817, (3) because the construction is like that of ἦ μὴν with a prospective mood, and for three other reasons which it is scarcely worth while to repeat. On the strength of this reasoning we are regaled (in p. 555) with such readings as οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐ μὴν πῆγ (Luke 1, 15), οὐ μὴν ἀπόδονται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (Joh. 10, 28). One more quotation and I

have done. On p. 562 we read 'As to Biblical Greek there is not one authenticated instance of the use of the secondary subjunctive (the optative) in dependent clauses,' 'the four cases commonly adduced (Mark 14, 10 ἀπῆλθεν ἵνα παραδοί, ib. 9, 30 οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις αὐτὸν γνοί...) are obviously scholastic transcriptions of παραδῆ and γνῆ (αι=η), which latter are due to the analogy of other forms' (!) Yet in the next page we have a list, said to be 'nearly complete' of 28 examples from the N.T. where the secondary subjunctive is used with indirect questions or parenthetical clauses introduced by εἰ. A similar list is given in p. 474, where again it is suggested that some of the optatives may represent original subjunctives, the homophonous endings αι and η having given rise to 'itacistic misspelling.'

Dr. Jannaris takes credit to himself for having devoted to his task more than five

whole years (p. vi.). I wish he had spent at least double that time upon it, and he might then have given us a far more satisfactory book. Still, with all its glaring faults, its unpardonable hastiness and rashness, it remains in my opinion the best book of its kind in English, the most useful help to all students of post-classical Greek. I may mention in conclusion that I have noticed three misprints: p. 216, § 850b, 'Popular speech substituted the sonant -ov for -ω, that is -ωμεν for -ομεν, -ωσι for -οσι, -ωμαι for -ομαι, -ωμεθα for -ομεθα, -ωνται for -ονται,' where it is evident both from the general rule and the examples which follow, e.g. τιμούντες, ἡρώων, that we should read -ομεν for -ωμεν, etc.; p. 334, § 1292 for 'amuse' read 'accuse'; p. 453, § 1940 for οἴητο read οἴοιτο.

J. B. MAYOR.

#### AUDEN'S EDITION OF THE PRO PLANCIO.

*Cicero Pro Plancio*, edited with Introduction and Notes by H. W. AUDEN, M.A., Macmillan. pp. lxxxiv. 150. 3s. 6d.

It is impossible to say there is any real need for this book, for in no respect does it appear superior to Holden's well known edition. By this it is not meant to disparage Mr. Auden's work, which is not without merit, but it seems a pity that he has attempted to do over again what has already been done so well. The introduction is excellent. The summary of the history of rhetoric contains a great deal of information clearly and concisely put. The editor has evidently studied the best books on this subject, and has thus been able to write an interesting epitome. The notes are fairly good and accurate, but in one or two cases there is room for improvement: e.g. in a note on page 57 it is stated that Continentia = Gk. σωφροσύνη 'perfect self-control.' It is more correct to say that Continentia = Gk.

ἐγκράτεια and translate both words by 'self-control,' wherein is implied an effort which is not implied in σωφροσύνη, Latin Temperantia, 'perfect self-control.' On page 62 Medius fidius is explained as 'Medius = me, a demonstrative particle, cf. mehercle mecastor etc., and dius an older stage of deus. If this explanation is preferable to the old one (which the editor seems to adopt on page 123) me deus fidius sc. adiuvet, some more information on the 'demonstrative particle' me might be expected. Scilicet (page 120) is explained as "sci licet 'know, you may do so': thus in general sense the same as scire licet, which the Romans themselves imagined to be the full form of it, cf. videlicet.' In this case I think the Romans imagined correctly. Mr. Auden has qualification for editing a speech of Cicero; and this makes it the more to be regretted that he did not edit one which has not already appeared with English notes.

W. E. P. COTTER.

#### HALL'S EDITION OF THE FOURTH VERRINE.

*The Fourth Verrine of Cicero*, edited for schools by F. W. Hall, M. A. Macmillan. pp. lx. 187. 3s. 6d.

Mr. Hall's notes are short, but helpful, and he has wisely avoided encumbering them by

the quotation of a large number of parallel passages. Those he does give are brief, and to the point. In a few cases brevity has been too much aimed at—e.g. the notes on cybaea (chap. 8), divisores (chap. 20), discessio (chap. 65). The derivation of the

first word ought to have been mentioned, and more detailed notes might have been expected in a school edition on such technical words as *divisores* (the note on which is 'bribery agents') and *discessio*. Teachers, however, are not likely to find fault with notes which are short, and accurate, and such Mr. Hall's are. The Introduction is very well written. All that the learner can want to know on the law '*De pecuniis Repetundis*,' and the 'Procedure in a Roman trial' he will find

clearly stated in sections ii. and iii. Sections v. vi. deal with 'the chronology of the trial,' and 'the Romans and the Fine Arts.' A short account of the MSS. of Book iv. is given in section vii. The Archaeological Appendix will be found useful. The editor has done his work well and as the speech has not yet been edited in English, his book will form a welcome addition to Messrs. Macmillan's Classical Series.

W. E. P. COTTER.

#### NOTES TO TYRRELL'S THIRD EDITION OF THE *MILES GLORIOSUS*.

THIS admirable school edition has already passed through three editions and three reprints, the last appearing in 1894. In the Preface to the last edition the statement is made: 'I have now, I hope, removed all the errors of the Press which occurred in the earlier editions.' A number of errors, however, still remain, chiefly of a metrical nature. The object of the present paper is to point these out, for the benefit of students who may be using the edition, and with the hope that the corrections may be of service when the time comes for a revision.

The METRICAL ERRORS are of two kinds:

(a) *The omission of an ictus mark:* of these there are sixty-seven:—

Verses 156, 162, 164, 169, 175, 176, 181, 187, 222, 230, 248, 284, 313, 339, 355, 356, 387, 404, 413, 424, 436, 460, 507, 517, 522, 540, 643, 679, 684, 699, 739, 773, 778, 791, 809, 883, 893, 920, 935, 946, 949, 1004, 1037, 1050, 1145, 1163, 1195, 1200, 1207, 1218, 1307, 1317, 1321, 1327, 1328, 1344, 1345, 1366, 1374, 1386, 1387, 1395, 1396, 1408, 1417, 1425, 1428.

(b) *An excess of ictus marks:* of these there are seven:—

Verses 246, 322, 1003, 1021, 1331, 1402, 1415.

A few minor TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS have been noticed:

Page 53, verse 598: period after *loco* instead of comma.

Page 61, verse 685 is not numbered.

Page 167, verse 296, 'compound' for 'compounds.'

The following statements found in the notes need revision:—

Page 137, verse 7: 'Bx. recognises only

one case of *quod*.' Bx. *Trin.* 290, however, cites three examples.

Page 144, 57, 'ne = nonne, which is not found in old Latin,' also on p. 169; 'nonne is post-Plautine.' But cf. Brix. *Men.* 283, Schmalz, *Lat. Syntax*, § 157, Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* p. 605.

Page 146, 84: the statement in regard to the occurrence of forms in *-ai* is inexact. It has a wider use than one would suppose from the note.

Page 171, 357: *nunciam* is explained as from *nunci*. But is this view tenable? (Cf. Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* p. 610.)

Page 176, 430: 'persectari is ἀπ. εἰρ.' But this word occurs twice in Lucretius, ii. 165 and iv. 1010. (Munro, it may be noted, in his note to ii. 165 says this word 'appears to be peculiar to Luer'.)

Page 185, 587: 'A reference to the crit. note will show, etc.' But where is this note to be found? I have been unable to find it in this edition.

On Page 164, 273 the statement is made that '*Certo* is found only in comic poets and Cic. (chiefly in his *Epp.*).' The same statement occurs in Tyrrell's edition of *The Correspondence of Cicero*, vol. i. p. 60. It probably comes from White and Riddle's Dictionary ['found only in the comic poets, and sts. (most freq. in his *Epist.*) in Cicero'], and seems to be perpetuated not only here, but, implicitly, in the fact that Harper's Dictionary gives examples only from Plautus, Terence, and Cicero. The actual facts are otherwise, however. Georges (sub v. *certo*) cites Apuleius, *nos certo certius dedere quam*, etc., to be found in *Met.* ix. 41 (Hildebrand). To this I wish to add Martial's *certo meruisti*, iv. 75, 7; Val. Maximus, iv. 8, 5, *ut certo constet*; Fronto i. 7 (p. 179, 6, Naber) *certo*

scio; Apuleius, *Met.* x. 5, damnatum iri certo sciebat. Neue, *Formenlehre*, II.<sup>3</sup>, p. 621, cites Sallust, *Cat.* 51, 16; <sup>1</sup> *Jug.* 9, 2.<sup>1</sup> As far as Cicero's use is concerned, *certo* occurs thirty-four times in the Letters (cf. Neue II.<sup>3</sup> p. 620), fourteen times in the Orations, and five times in the Philosophical

<sup>1</sup> So Dietsch.

Writings (Merguet, *Lexikon*). *Quasi certo* occurs in *Tusc.* v. 81. *Certo scio* also occurs in *Auctor ad Heren.* iv. 56 (Marx).

Of the book, as a whole, it need hardly be added at this late date that it merits only words of praise.

EMORY B. LEASE.

University of Michigan.

### FUEGNER'S LEXICON LIVIANUM.

WITH the eighth part the first volume of this work, comprising letters A and B, has just been completed. Critics have repeatedly warned the author that he planned his work on too large a scale. The publisher, Teubner, tells us that unless a considerable number of additional subscribers comes forward, he cannot carry the book to an end. The author gives a specimen of articles on a reduced scale, which would allow the completion of the alphabet in four volumes instead of seven or eight. It will be a

great blow to Latin scholarship if the materials, which are ready, must be deposited in some library, instead of passing through the Press for the common good.

The Tacitean Lexicon, by Gerber and Greef, published by the same firm, is nearly complete. New subscribers to Fügner will not long have to bear the burden of the double subscription.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

Cambridge.

### A PORTRAIT.

That is his portrait painted by himself.  
Look on those manly curls so glossy dark,  
Those thoughtful furrows in the swarthy  
cheek;  
Admire that stalwart shape, those ample  
brows,  
And that large table of the breast disspread  
Between low shoulders: how demure a  
smile,  
How full of wisest humour and of love,  
With some half-consciousness of inward  
power  
Sleeps round those quiet lips; not quite a  
smile;  
And look you what an arch the brain has  
built  
Above the ear! and what a settled mind,  
Mature, harbour'd from change, contemplative,  
Tempers the peaceful light of hazel eyes,  
Observing all things. This is he I loved,  
This is the man of whom you heard me  
speak.<sup>1</sup>

TENNYSON.

### SIC ORA FEREBAT.

ecce virum, sua quem pinxit manus! ecce  
virilem  
caesariem, crinesque nigros per colla fluentes  
sulcatasque genas curarum pondere: formam  
conspice robustam et spatia ardua frontis et  
inter  
summissos umeros latum se effundere pectus.  
circum labra viden, sapientia mitis amorque  
collidunt, tanquam ipse sua quae mente  
laterent  
divinare opes, risu premeretque sereno—  
si modo risus erat—quanta cerebrum ecce  
columna  
pone aurem sese erexit! tum nescia labi  
mens contemplatur securo iamota recessu  
res varias hominum et liquido splendore nitentes  
temperat informans oculos: ipsum aspice,  
qualem  
dilexi, quem te coram sermone ferebam.

E. D. STONE.

<sup>1</sup> These lines, published in the *Life of Lord Tennyson*, are printed here by the kind permission of Messrs. Macmillan.



## ARCHAEOLOGY.

TSOUNTAS AND MANATT'S  
MYKENAEEAN AGE.

*The Mykenaeen Age: A Study of the Monuments and Culture of pre-Homeric Greece.* By Drs. CHESTOS TSOUNTAS and J. IRVING MANATT. With an Introduction by Dr. DÖRPFELD. London: Macmillan & Co., 1897. [8vo. pp. xxxi. 417, xxii. Plates, 169 Illustrations in the Text]. 24s.

THE earlier years of prehistoric archaeology in Greece were so closely associated with the name and personality of Dr. Schliemann, that it was natural that the first attempt to review the results in this field of enquiry should take the form of a biographical rather than a purely critical memoir. Dr. Schuchhardt's '*Schliemann's Ausgrabungen*,' both in its original form, and in an excellent English translation, necessarily ignored much that had been done by other hands, even in Schliemann's lifetime. And already before the book appeared, the supplementary excavations of the Greek Archaeological Society at Mykenae itself, and of individual investigators elsewhere, had further modified current opinion on a number of important points.

There was consequently every reason for the publication of a more comprehensive treatise, when, some years ago, Dr. Tsountas, on whose shoulders in the directest sense the mantle of Schliemann fell, was asked to contribute an account of Mykenae to a popular series of 'famous sites' to be published in Romaic, and at Athens. The projected series came to nothing; but Dr. Tsountas modified and amplified his contribution, and published it separately in 1893, under the title *Μυκῆναι καὶ Μυκηναϊκὸς πολιτισμὸς*; a work in which, in spite of the careful recasting which it underwent before publication, the locality of Mykenae exercises almost as disproportionate an influence, as the personality of Schliemann in Dr. Schuchhardt's book.

How the work under review grew out of Dr. Tsountas' original book is explained in Dr. Manatt's preface. As it stands, it is a compilation from a number of sources, and by a number of hands, somewhat lightly compacted by a single editor. Dr. Tsountas has contributed the substance of his original book, apparently with some corrections, and also some additional material, including

what are practically abstracts of Mr. Evans' papers on Mykenaeen writing, of Dr. Dörpfeld's *Troja 1893*, and of M. Stais' paper on the Attic Salamis in the *Πρακτικά*. He has also seen the proofs 'without taking exception to any point'; but Prof. Manatt expressly releases him from any more direct responsibility in detail. Dr. Dörpfeld has been prevailed upon to write a short Introduction, which is mainly a criticism of some of the architectural views expressed in the body of the book. Appendix B incorporates Prof. Frothingham's summary of M. de Ridder's excavation at Gha, and an abstract of Dr. Noack's paper on the same site. For the remainder Dr. Barker Newhall and Prof. Manatt are mainly responsible, though the name of the former, as draft-translator from the Romaic, does not appear on the title-page.

The book is copiously illustrated; a number of the drawings are new, and the photographic plates are well rendered, with the exception of Pl. iii., a difficult subject, but one in which the middle distance and background which are invisible, would have been even more valuable to the historical student than the foreground. It is a pity, however, that the sources of the remainder of the line drawings have not been indicated, at all events in the list on pp. v.-ix.; if only in justice to the draughtsmen of the new ones. One or two slips may be noted: the line drawings figs. 6 and 135 are referred to in the text as 'photographic views,' which is misleading; after fig. 14, a reproduction of Schuchhardt's fig. 286 seems to be promised, but does not appear; fig. 120 is quoted in illustration of two types of ornament, neither of which appear in it; and the 'Façade of a Beehive Tomb,' fig. 46, might well have been described somewhere in detail, seeing that it represents the notable tomb at the Heraion. The map, Pl. ii., gives the railway and physical features imperfectly, and the modern roads not at all. It is 'based upon Steffen' and preserves *B* and *Gb* along with *Mt*: *Kiatu* should be *Kiato*, and *Pronia*, as in the text (p. 6), *Pronoia*. *Lechaion* is omitted, though there is a prehistoric site there. In pl. viii. the inner portico of the gate fails to correspond with the description in the text, though in pl. vi. it is right. On p. 26, l. 2 from the bottom, and referring to pl. ix., *H* (*η* in *Μυκ.*) should be *G*.

The book is handsomely and carefully printed, and has upon the cover an effective reproduction of the scene on one of the gold cups from Vaphio.

As a popular illustrated handbook to an attractive period of ancient art and civilisation, the work will probably succeed in maintaining itself; but as a working textbook of our present knowledge of the Mykenaeen Age, it is certainly in many respects disappointing, more especially considering the materials more immediately at hand. Prof. Manatt has used his opportunities of remodelling Dr. Tsountas' work either too much or too little. If he and Dr. Newhall had been content with their original project of a translation, revised and enlarged, but still directly *authorised*, of the original essay, the large English-reading public would have been indebted to them for a direct introduction to the maturer views of one of the most industrious and most fortunate of all the first-hand authorities in this field of research; and, with the sixth volume of 'Perrot and Chipiez' at our elbow, we might well have overlooked any lacunae which Dr. Tsountas' pressing duties in the field might have prevented him from filling himself at second hand.

On the other hand, if Prof. Manatt had been prepared to publish a 'Mykenaeen Age' of his own, we should no doubt have had a series of adequate abstracts of previously published work, with systematic references to the original publications of Dr. Tsountas and others; and a certain understanding that where no authority was quoted, Prof. Manatt personally was responsible for the statement. And, as he spent some time in Greece between 1889 and 1893, it is conceivable that such occasions might have been frequent.

In the event, however, he has fallen somewhat between two stools. It is seldom clear, except by comparison with the original Romaic, whether a statement rests on Dr. Tsountas' authority, or on the joint authority of the collaborators, or on that of Prof. Manatt simply. In particular, the familiar 'we,' which in the Romaic was idiomatic and convincing, is far too freely used in a joint work for which apparently neither collaborator accepts definite responsibility; and is distinctly misleading in Dr. Tsountas' original statements, e.g. pp. 150, 270, 284, or interpolated among them, e.g. p. 62; or, worse still, in testimony to discoveries and observations made after Prof. Manatt's departure from Greece; e.g. pp. 133, 261. The absence of a bibliography, and of any

allusion even to Dr. Blinkenberg's detailed analysis of the Cycladic data; the paucity of new references in the footnotes; and the omission of some of the most important references of the original; e.g. *Μυκῆναι*, pp. 8, 205, add to the uncertainties arising from this avoidance of explicit responsibility. The translation itself, even where it is interpolated for any considerable space, is curiously unequal, and contains a number of actual blunders. *ἔντυπος* (Muk. p. 50) does not mean 'incised,' (E.T. p. 76) but 'stamped' or 'impressed': *δύο συμμετρικῶν οἰκημάτων...* *ἐκατέρωθεν* (Muk. p. 200) is rendered 'a smaller building...alongside of' (E.T. p. 252), without note of a correction: *ἤλεκτρον* in *Od.* iv. 71 ff. where it stands between 'gold' and 'silver' is rendered 'amber' (E.T. p. 62): *αἱ τετραπλημέναι αἰχμαὶ τῆς Ἀμοργῶν* (Muk. p. 211) appears as 'the old-fashioned spear-heads of Amorgos' (E.T. p. 267): *κοιλότητες* (Muk. p. 38) are not 'grooves' (E.T. p. 60) but 'hollows,' or, more particularly, 'sockets.' The abbreviations ΒΔ and ΝΔ are translated 'eastern' (E.T. p. 7) and ΒΔ and ΒΑ are omitted (E.T. p. 27-8 = Muk. p. 15).

Dates are very freely rendered: *πένηνσι* means 1892 on p. 168, 1893 on p. 171; and the date of the excavation at Vaphio is differently given in Muk. p. 15, E.T. p. 7. 'Εφ. Ἀρχ. 1877, in a note on p. 58, should be 1887.

More remarkable are some expressions in the English where no Romaic equivalent occurs in *Μυκῆναι*. 'Votive' for 'votive offering,' p. 143; 'defense,' p. 15; 'gew-gaws,' p. 226; 'measurably new' p. xiv. (? *μετρίως*); 'back of that decadence,' p. 4, 'sea-food,' p. 69; may be American idioms. 'The standard stuff' (? *ἔλῃ*), p. 223; and 'bloomtime,' p. 220, have a Teutonic air. 'A vacuum of 8-10 inches deep,' p. 31n.; 'ivory trimmings' (*κοσμήματα*, Muk. p. 51 = E.T. 78); 'Palamedes,' p. 6, for the 'Palamidi' of Baedeker, Schuchhardt, and others; 'more or less fearfully and wonderfully garnished,' of a leathern helmet, p. 196; 'cheek by jowl,' of the figures on an ivory mirror-handle, p. 188; and 'the "graffito" method of fresco-painting' (? *sgraffito*), p. 233; are less explicable. The Trojan idols are not 'chalked' with owl-like features, p. 296, but *incised*; and 'he has chalked out a new chapter of Genesis,' is neither an adequate account of the Pitane-vase, nor an elegant translation of the original French (Perrot-Chipiez vi. 932).

More serious misconceptions are betrayed by the very loose usage, pp. 241, 244-5, of

the difficult words 'glaze' and 'varnish'; the latter being repeatedly used for Furtwängler's *Firnisfarbe*; of 'enameled' (*sic*) p. 202, for the inlaid work on the dagger blades from the shaft graves; and of 'Mykenaeon,' without distinction, of the spoils of Mykenae itself, and of Aegean civilisation in general. Dr. Tsountas always uses *πόρπη* for a *fibula*, and explains it (*Mvk.* p. 57) by *παπαλίνα* 'safety-pin.' Prof. Manatt confuses this *πόρπη* with the *περόνη* of *Hdt.* v. 82, 87, a passage which he seems to regard, p. 163, as referring to the mythical age of Greece.

Other points in which revision is required are the interpretation of quite familiar floral '*Füllen-ornamente*' on the golden diadem, pl. xii., as Ψ-like and Υ-like symbols, p. 177; and of the old man's shield on the silver vase, p. 162, with a *χαίνα*: the gold-wire theory of spiral ornament, which becomes increasingly difficult in face of Egyptian prototypes in stone; and the allusion to Meriones' helmet (*Il.* x. 362), which is exactly reproduced in the boar-tusk helmet inadequately described in fig. 85. The new painted stele, though it is actually mentioned, p. 153, is nowhere fully described, even in outline.<sup>1</sup> The chapter on 'The Islands as Mediators in Art,' serves to introduce some new data on Amorgos, but is barely adequate as a statement of this important question, and that on the 'Mykenaeon World and Homer,' with which the book ends, is of the very slightest texture.

It is much to be regretted that a book so much needed, and in many ways so elaborately prepared, should have been allowed to appear with these many blemishes upon it; and still more that Dr. Tsountas' work and reputation should have been introduced to what must be a very large circle of readers, in so vague and elusive a costume.

J. L. MYRES.

#### TWO BOOKS BY M. S. REINACH.

- (1) *Répertoire de la Statuaire Grecque et Romaine*: Tome I. Clarac de poche, contenant les Bas-reliefs de l'ancien fonds du Louvre et les Statues antiques du Musée

<sup>1</sup> On p. 26 the hackneyed and wholly erroneous parallel between the 'galleries' at Tiryns and certain chambers on the Byrsa at Carthage is repeated, though it is rejected by Dr. Tsountas (*Mvk.* p. 227). When will compilers discover that these notorious structures are of late Roman Imperial date?

*de Sculpture* de Clarac: Paris, Leroux, 1897. 5 frs.

- (2) *Chroniques d'Orient*: documents sur les fouilles et découvertes dans l'Orient Hellénique: deuxième série, Paris, Leroux, 1896. 15 frs.

THERE lie before me, unnoticed for too long a period, two volumes, published by M. S. Reinach in his great enterprise of making the materials for archaeological and topographical study accessible to ordinary scholars. A large fortune is required to purchase the elaborate and expensive folios, in which the results of travel and excavation are often enshrined—folios in which a comparatively slight text sinks into insignificance in comparison with a stately array of beautiful plates, containing photographic representations of everything important, and of some things that can hardly be called important, that are alluded to in the text. I confess that I feel much sympathy with the vigorous language in which M. Reinach sometimes expresses himself against the unnecessarily expensive character of so many archaeological works; and every one must sympathize with his attempt, carried out with so much knowledge, patience, skill, and research, to counteract that great evil.

The *Répertoire de la Statuaire* is intended to be a collection (complete, or as nearly complete as care and work can make the first essay of such a gigantic scheme) of the types of Greek statuary. The present volume is the first of three, and each volume is to be sold at the ridiculously cheap rate of five francs. It is past my comprehension how a book like this can be produced at such a figure; and, considering what the price is, it also passes my comprehension how any scholar can refrain from purchasing a copy. In this volume we have the whole of Clarac's *Musée de Sculpture*, the one great collection of types, to which everyone must often turn. Naturally the reproductions are not good enough, or on a large enough scale, to show the style and character of each statue; but they are practically as useful as Clarac's, and they are sufficient to be used as a basis for studying the types which were originated in the development of Greek Sculpture, and for acquiring some conception of the variety and locality of the existing specimens of each type.

The second volume is to contain the reproduction of six thousand statues in the Museums of Europe; and the third a description and critical remarks of the whole,

together with a general index. But the first volume has already its own index of forty pages, together with brief *Notices Prévisoires*, referring to important publications concerning many of the works reproduced from Clarac.

The difficult problem of arranging on a scientific principle such a vast collection is, of course, not solved in this book, as M. Reinach recognizes in his preface. I do not see how it could be solved without vast expense and much combination of labour; and the only practicable method in a cheap book is a collection roughly classified and accompanied by indexes. If I were a working student, instead of a mere amateur in Greek art, I should keep several copies of the book, to cut up gradually and rearrange on several principles of classification.

An interesting account of the life of Count de Clarac, who ruined himself partly by his great book and partly by his inability to attain satisfaction with the form of his printed works, until he had seen and cut up a score of proofs and revises, is one of those pious duties to a predecessor which M. Reinach performs in so many cases and always with taste, felicity, and care.

(2) The second volume of the *Chroniques d'Orient* contains an account of the discoveries in the eastern Greek world between autumn 1890 and autumn 1895; and I may venture to speak of it, even though M. Reinach has done me the honour to dedicate it to me. The same qualities, with greater experience and wider knowledge, characterize the new volume as the former one (noticed in the *Classical Review*, 1891, vol. v. p. 131). Whenever I have to speak or write about any place in the eastern Greek world, I turn to the Index to the *Chroniques*, and find thereby what has been done, and what discovered in recent years; and even with regard to central Asia Minor I have learned from M. Reinach about various publications and sources of information, which in the far north I might otherwise not have heard of for years. The incisive, but always straightforward and sympathetic, criticisms with which M. Reinach interspaces his record of discoveries, are expressed in crisp, graceful, and delicate style, and make the *Chroniques* everywhere interesting and amusing reading. The volume, containing 662 large and closely printed pages, costs like its predecessor only fifteen francs.

In two *Appendices* M. Reinach reprints his *Mirage Oriental*, and its sequel *Les Déesses nues dans l'Art Oriental et dans l'Art Grec*, in which clear perception of the essential

originality of Greek Art has perhaps led him too far in the direction of denying Greek indebtedness to the east. A pupil may learn much from a teacher, and yet remain essentially original and creative. But the view set forth in these two papers is worth study from many points of view; and is a valuable corrective to an error, sometimes admitted almost unconsciously, that when one has observed an analogy between an Oriental and a Greek type, the origin of the latter is discovered. Even granting that the latter was suggested by the older type (and priority has to be proved), there still remains very much to be added before you have the whole Greek idea.

W. M. RAMSAY.

#### MACDONALD'S *TITULI HUNTERIANI*.

*Tituli Hunteriani: an Account of the Roman stones in the Hunterian Museum, University of Glasgow*, by JAMES MACDONALD M.A., LL.D. (Glasgow: Annan). Pp. xii. + 102, 4to.

THE inscribed and sculptured Roman stones in the possession of the Glasgow University were for the most part presented in the eighteenth century (1694-1771) by various Scotch benefactors, who desired to place in safe custody various stones found along the Vallum of Antoninus Pius. When the Hunterian collections were presented to the University in 1783, the Roman stones, some thirty in number, were incorporated with them and acquired the name 'Hunterian' though they had nothing to do with Dr. Hunter himself. Since 1783 over a dozen additions have been made, bringing the number of stones up to forty-five. Dr. Macdonald's Catalogue of them, well printed in a fine quarto and most admirably illustrated, is a most adequate and useful work. It does not, of course, include all the lapidary monuments of the Vallum, for some of these are in the Edinburgh museum and some still in private houses. But it includes enough to give any one a clear idea of what these lapidary monuments are. I must not praise it in detail, as I helped to read the proof sheets, but I may be allowed to point out two good features. Dr. Macdonald has bestowed real care on fixing the proper *provenances* of the stones, rather obscure in some cases, and he and his publishers have provided illustrations in photogravure of every stone. These illustrations are most admirable: I do not



know any epigraphic treatise which is better equipped in this respect. The publication of really scholarly and well-illustrated local catalogues is among the needs of the time: Dr. Macdonald has met this need for Glasgow University.

F. HAVERFIELD.

## MONTHLY RECORD.

### ITALY.

*Savignano*, near Rimini. Two large pavements with fine polychrome mosaics have recently been found here. The design on the larger consists of eight octagons surrounding a central one, three of them being now lost. They are divided by cable-patterns, and each contains an elaborate geometrical pattern. Along one side is a border of five circles filled with cable and other patterns. The other pavement is decorated with circles united by inter-twining cable-patterns; in the circles are fishes, amphorae, and quatrefoils. The pavements are probably of late date.<sup>1</sup>

*Barbarano*, Etruria. An interesting bronze horse's bit has recently been found here and acquired for the National Museum in Rome. It has a fine patina, and consists of two curved pieces ending in knobs, united by a twisted cross-piece with hooks in the middle; the construction is very elaborate. It belongs to the first period of the Iron Age, contemporary with the Ronzano swords. Bits of similar date and character are discussed by Gozzadini, *Mors de cheval italiques* (1875); there are also examples in the Etruscan Room of the British Museum.<sup>2</sup>

*Sassoferrato*, Umbria. A very interesting series of terracotta figures has come to light here. They were mostly in fragments, but have been restored and put together to form groups. The first group represents Ariadne sleeping in Naxos, and found by Dionysos with his accompanying *thiasos* of Satyrs and Selleni. A female figure which stands at Ariadne's head has been interpreted as Aphrodite, but from the short chiton (*ἑφῶπις*) which she wears, seems rather to resemble Artemis. One of the Satyrs holds up his hands in the *ἀνοσχομένῳ* attitude. The second group is similar, but has four figures as against six. The third group consists of two winged female figures raising heavy drapery between them over their heads; above them in the background is Eros holding out both hands, which appear to have held crowns. A winged youth with a torch (*Hymenaeos*?) stands by. The subject may be the marriage of Dionysos and Ariadne. These groups may have come from the pediment of a temple; the remaining figures seem to be from a frieze. These latter represent a battle with Gauls, in which Artemis takes part, and there seems every ground for identifying it with the attack on Delphi in B.C. 279 (Paus. x. 20, 3). Two of the Gauls are represented carrying off an amphora and a patera of metal, indicating the spoils of the temple. The figure of Artemis is evidently copied from the frieze of the Pergamene altar.<sup>3</sup>

*Palestrina*. Recent excavations have resulted in the discovery of several tombs containing Etruscan and other objects. In one tomb were found a pear-shaped gold bulla, a gold ring with a figure of a

Camillus holding jug and patera, an egg-shaped vase with paintings of two birds on a white ground, and a similar vase with diaper patterns in red and black on white. In another were two crescent-shaped granulated gold earrings of Etruscan type and other ornaments, and a piece of *aes rude* of the third century B.C. In a third were a balsamarium with egg-shaped body and chains attached, set in an open work stand (cf. *Mon. dell. Inst.* viii. 58) and a gilt ivy-wreath.<sup>4</sup>

*Benevento*. A *cippus miliaris* of local limestone has recently come to light near here, bearing the name of Hadrian, and the distance *MP XVDCL* (15750 paces). The milestones on the Appian Way were restored by Hadrian in A.D. 123. On the base of the *cippus* is inscribed *CLXVIII* (169 miles from Rome), and above, *V* (five miles from Beneventum). Other milestones give Beneventum as 164 miles from Rome, thus confirming this one (*C.I.L.* ix. p. 602, x. p. 700).<sup>5</sup>

*Sala Consilina*, Lucania. Finds of bronze, silver, and pottery have been made here: in silver, six boat-shaped fibulae, pendants, and ornaments; in bronze, a hydria, an oinochoe with handle in form of a youth leaning back, a phiale of Apulian type on a tripod, a *simpulum*, and a fibula of 'snake'-type. Among the vases are several of Italian fabric with geometrical decoration and patterns of leaves, mostly craters.<sup>6</sup>

*Tarentum*. Considerable excavations were carried on during 1896, with the following results: A gold ring with paste setting, design of Aphrodite holding out crown to Eros; a terracotta comic actor with basket (a slave returning from market), and another holding a baby, perhaps a *παῖδαγωγός*; a fragment of a Panathenaic amphora inscribed in graffito *ONATHEN*, completing another fragment in the Museum inscribed *ΘΕΝΑΘVON*; a marble statue of Herakles reclining, of the type identified by Petersen with *H. Olivarius*; eight fragmentary b.f. kylikes, all of the 'Kleinmeister' type. Two of the last-named bear the signature of a new artist: *ΑΝΤΙΔΟΡΟΣΕΓΓΟΕ*, 'Αντίδορος ἐγγόει'.<sup>7</sup>

*Pompeii*. Some interesting wall-paintings have been discovered on the peristyle of a house, in panels on a black ground with red borders. One represents a poetess reciting to a companion, the other, two girls in picturesque attitudes (cf. *Notizie*, 1884, p. 112).<sup>8</sup>

*Boscotrecase*. Further excavations have taken place on the site of a Roman villa, which consists of two parts divided by a peristyle, the eastern for the proprietor, the western for offices, etc. In the triclinium are paintings, representing landscapes, fishing-scenes and buildings, also a panel with a hoopoe and swallow, and another with a jay pecking at a plant. The *torcularium* is well preserved; in it is a painting of Bacchus leaning on a Seilenos and giving wine to a panther.<sup>9</sup>

*Torre Annunziata*. An interesting mosaic has been discovered, representing a meeting of philosophers, like Raphael's *Scuola di Atene*. In the background is a rough representation of a walled citadel (the Acropolis of Athens?), and columns surmounted by vases and a sun-dial. One old man of venerable aspect may be intended for Plato; there are seven figures in all.<sup>10</sup>

*Rome*. Much interest has been aroused by a recent discovery in the ruins of the Palace of

<sup>1</sup> *Notizie degli Scavi*, Sept. 1897.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.* Apr. 1897.

<sup>3</sup> *Notizie degli Scavi*, July 1897.

<sup>4</sup> *Notizie degli Scavi*, June 1897.

<sup>5</sup> *Notizie degli Scavi*, May 1897.

<sup>6</sup> *Notizie degli Scavi*, Aug. 1897.

Tiberius on the Palatine of a *graffito* supposed to represent the Crucifixion. It is in a corner under a gallery made by Caligula to pass from the Palace to the Forum. It represents two high poles united at the top by a long cross-bar, with a shorter bar about one-third of the height down each pole, thus forming a cross of the traditional type. Against each of these cross-bars a ladder is placed, one of which a figure inscribed *TERTIVS* is ascending; another named *PILVS* stands on the other cross-bar wielding a mallet. There are traces of a third ladder and a rope in the middle. From each cross-bar hangs a rope held by a figure named respectively *FILETVS* and *NESTVLVS*. Between them is a man named *EVLOGVS* grasping another, as if with the intention of removing his garments. Above is the remarkable inscription *CRESTVS VIRGIS EXACT' COESVS 'SECRETIS MORIS SVPER PALVM VIRVM FIXVM*, and the intervening space is filled with an amatory couplet, which has of course nothing to with the design. One other interesting feature may be mentioned; a man ascends the ladder on the right carrying an oblong board, in which it is tempting to see a *titulus*, the 'superscription' of the Gospels. The genuineness of the whole design is said to be quite above suspicion.<sup>7</sup>

## SARDINIA.

*Cagliari*. A new inscription has been found, with a dedication to Domitian of A.D. 83, being a memorial of the public works carried out by the *municipium*. A new procurator's name occurs, *S. Laecanius Labeo*. This inscription has an important bearing on the Roman administration in the island. It alludes to the laying down of streets and roads and the making and covering over of drains with public and private money, and further it shows that Vespasian had taken away the province from the Senate about A.D. 78, contrary to the view previously held. Under Marcus Aurelius it returned to the Senate, but was finally given back to the Emperor under Commodus or Septimius Severus.<sup>8</sup>

## GREECE.

*Athens*. A series of archaic tombs has been discovered on the Areopagus, in which the bodies had all been burned. They contained vases of the earlier Dipylon style and swords of the same period.<sup>9</sup>

A new inscription has been found during the excavations at the foot of the Acropolis to the north, where the inscription concerning the temple of Athena Nike was previously found. It has been restored by M. Kavvadias. It is a *ψήφισμα* of Alcibiades and concerns events alluded to in Thuc. viii. 23, 5, and 31, 1. In B.C. 412 the Athenians had again occupied the disaffected Clazomenae, while their enemies remained in Daphnus. On a later occasion we hear of an attempt by the Spartan fleet under Astyochos to take Clazomenae. A

change in Daphnus follows this move, and it becomes the head-quarters of the partisans of Athens, but Thucydides does not make it clear how this happened. The gap in his narrative is filled by the *ψήφισμα*, which is a ratification of the action of the Strategi in the time of anarchy following the revolutionary policy of Pisander.<sup>2</sup>

H. B. WALTERS.

*Revue Numismatique*. Part iv. 1897.

E. Babelon. 'La Collection Waddington au Cabinet des Médailles.' A continuation of the 'Inventaire sommaire' describing coins of Ionia and Caria, with two Plates.—J. Martha. 'Sur quelques types des monnaies de Brutus.' The types referred to are Apolline and it is suggested that the *gens* Junia had some special connection with Apollo, dating from the time when L. Junius Brutus, accompanied by the sons of Tarquin, consulted the oracle at Delphi. 'Apollo' was the watchword of the Republican army at the battle of Philippi (Plut. *Brutus*, 24).—M. Rostovtsew. 'Étude sur les plombs antiques.'—R. Mowat. 'Les noms de l'impératrice Maesa.' Coins of Ilium inscribed *MAMIA MAICA*. Unless the first word is a mistake for *IOVNA*, the full name of Maesa must have been Julia Mamaea Maesa.

*Numismatic Chronicle*. Part iv. 1897.

W. Greenwell. 'On some rare Greek coins.' The coins are all in Mr. Greenwell's collection. Among them may be noticed:—*Cyzicus*. A new electrum stater with a beautiful head of Demeter (Pl. xi. 1). *Phocaea*? Electrum hecte, early fifth cent. B.C., representing three seals swimming in a circle; also an early hecte with a *fibula*, a new type on coins. *Aenus*. A tetradrachm with the usual reverse, a goat, but with a charming adjunct, a child (infant Dionysos?) holding an ivy-spray to the goat's mouth (Pl. xiii. 3). *Olynthus*. A tetrobol, before circ. B.C. 433, with the types of Olynthus (free horse and eagle with serpent) but with the inscription *Chalk*. Mr. Greenwell suggests that coin was struck at Olynthus for a confederation of the towns of Chalcidice (cf. the fourth century coins of the Chalcidian league minted at Olynthus).—G. F. Hill. 'Solon's reform of the Attic standard.' An important paper in which 'A9. Παλ. c. 10 is considered in detail. G. F. Hill. 'Cartimandua.' On a small hoard found in 1893 at Honley, near Huddersfield, consisting of Roman coins and five silver British coins. The latter pieces belong to the Brigantes, of which tribe only gold money was hitherto known. One coin inscribed *CART* or *CARTI* is attributed by Mr. Hill to Queen Cartimandua, circ. A.D. 69 (Tac. *Ann.* xii. 36; *Hist.* iii. 45).

WARWICK WROTH.

<sup>7</sup> *Daily Chronicle*, 10 Feb. 1898.<sup>8</sup> *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 26 Feb. 1898.<sup>9</sup> *Athenaeum*, 5 March 1898.

## CORRECTION TO NOTE ON THE POLYZALOS INSCRIPTION (P. 142).

UNFORTUNATELY, M. Croiset's restoration<sup>1</sup> of the Polyzalos inscription had escaped my notice, when I contributed a suggestion to the last number of the *Classical Review*. See *C. R. de l'Acad. des Inscr.*, xxiv., pp. 214,

376. M. Homolle's communication, to which I referred, was published in the same volume, but I had read it in a *tirage à part*.

J. B. BURY.

<sup>1</sup> Proposed also, independently, by MM. Pottier and Th. Reinach.

## LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

## ENGLISH AND AMERICAN BOOKS.

- Allcroft* (A. H.) and W. F. Masom. Synopsis of Grecian history to 323 B.C. Crown 8vo. 72 pp. Clive. 2s. 6d.
- Aristotelis de arte poetica liber*, ed. I. Bywater. 8vo. Frowde. 1s. 6d.
- *Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*; critical text and translation by S. H. Butcher. 2nd ed. 8vo. 442 pp. Macmillan. 12s. 6d. net.
- *The Poetics*, text, notes, translation by S. H. Butcher. 2nd ed. 8vo. 134 pp. Macmillan. 4s. 6d. net.
- Crothers* (G. D.) and H. H. Bice. Elements of Latin for students of medicine and pharmacy. 12mo. 12, 242 pp. \$1.25.
- Euripides*. Medea, text, introduction, notes by C. E. S. Headlam. 12mo. 150 pp. Camb. Univ. Press. 2s. 6d.
- Gardner* (E. A.). A catalogue of the Greek vases in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. Imper. 8vo. Camb. Univ. Press. 12s. 6d. net.
- Greek Reader* (Higher). 132 Extracts from the best Writers, with appendix containing the Greek Unseens set at B.A. London, 1877—1897. 2nd ed. Crown 8vo. 169 pp. Clive. 3s. 6d.
- Holm* (A.). The history of Greece, translated from the German by F. Clarke. (4 vols.) Vol. I. 8vo. 650 pp. Macmillan. 7s. 6d.
- Homer*. The Iliads, translated by G. Chapman. 2 vols. 18mo. 624 pp. (Temple Classics.) Dent. 2s. each.
- *Odyssey*, translated into English verse by W. Cullen Bryant. 8vo. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin. \$1.
- Lindsay* (W. M.). Handbook of Latin Inscriptions, illustrating the history of language. 12mo. 140 pp. Putnams. 5s.
- Marcus Aurelius Antoninus to himself, translated with introductory study on Stoicism and the last of the Stoics, by G. H. Rendall. Crown 8vo. 342 pp. Macmillan. 6s.
- Mills* (T. R.) Greek verse Unseens. 12mo. 156 pp. Blackwood. 1s. 6d.
- Nepos* (Cornelius.) Timotheus, Phocion, Agesilaos, Epaminondas, Pelopidas, Timoleon, Eumenes, Datames, Hamilear, with notes and vocabulary by E. S. Shuckburgh. 12mo. 172 pp. Camb. Univ. Press. 1s. 6d.
- Ovid*. Metamorphoses, Book XIII. With Introduction, notes, vocabulary, test-papers, and translation by J. H. Haydon. Crown 8vo. 148 pp. Clive. 3s.
- Pausanias*. Description of Greece, translated with a commentary by J. G. Frazer. 6 vols. 8vo. Macmillan. £6 6s. nett.
- Plato*. Laches, with introduction, notes, vocabulary, test papers and translation by F. G. Plaistowe and T. R. Mills. Crown 8vo. 126 pp. Clive. 5s. 6d.
- Rouse* (W. H. D.) Atlas of Classical Portraits: Greek. Imper. 16mo. 44 pp. Dent. 1s. 6d.
- the same: Roman. Imperial 16mo. 72 pp. Dent. 1s. 6d.
- Virgil*. Works, with a commentary by J. Conington and H. Nettleship. Vol. I. Eclogues and Georgics. 5th ed. revis. by F. Haverfield. 8vo. 534 pp. Bell. 10s. 6d.
- Xenophon*. Anabasis, Book IV., ed. by W. H. Balgarnie. Crown 8vo. 88 pp. Clive. 3s. 6d.

## FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Aristotelis parva naturalia*, rec. Guil. Biehl. 12mo. xvii, 168 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 80.
- Aristoteles*. Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca. Edita consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae. Vol. IV. Part 5. Ammonius, in Aristotelis de interpretatione commentarius, ed. Adf. Busse. 8vo. lvi, 318 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 14 Mk.
- *L'Arronge* (H.) Aristoteles als Menschenkennner. 8vo. 66 pp. Jena.
- Bacchylides*. Wilamowitz-Möllendorf (Ulr. von.) Bakchylides. 8vo. 34 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 80 Pf.
- Bernhardt* (J. A.) Schriftquellen zur antiken Kunstgeschichte. 8vo. viii, 60, 64 pp. Dresden. Ehlermann. 2 Mk.
- Birke* (D.) De particularum *μή* et *οὐ* usu Polybiano Dionysiaco Diodoreo Straboniano. 8vo. 81 pp. Leipzig.
- Böhme* (U.) Ein Jahr Unterricht in der lateinischen Grammatik. (Lehraufgabe der Untertertia.) 8vo. vi, 111 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 1 Mk. 80.
- Bynum* (E. T.) Das Leben des Marcus Junius Brutus bis auf Caesars Ermordung. 8vo. v, 49 pp. Halle, Niemeyer. 1 Mk. 60.
- Caesaris Commentarii cum A. Hirtii aliorumque supplementis ex rec. B. Kübleri. Vol. III., pars 2. Commentarius de bello hispaniensi. (Ed. maior.) 12mo. xxii pp. and pages 105 to 266. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 50.
- Callimachus*. Kniper (K.) Studia Callimachea. II. De Callimachi theologumenis. 8vo. viii, 159 pp. Leiden, Sijthoff. 4 Mk.
- Cicero*. Schelle (E.) Der neueste Angriff auf die Echtheit der Briefe ad M. Brutum. 4to. 54 pp. Dresden.
- Cicero's Rede für Sex. Roscius aus Ameria, herausgegeben von K. Rossberg. 8vo. xx, 60 pp. Münster, Aschendorff. 75 Pf.
- Schramm (E.) De Ciceronis libris de legibus recensendis. Inest Birtii de 'quo' dativo appendix. 8vo. 67 pp. Marburg.
- Cohausen* (A. von.) Die Befestigungsweisen der Vorzeit und des Mittelalters, herausgegeben von Max Jähns. Royal 8vo. xlii, 340, 6 pp., and atlas of 57 plates, portrait. Wiesbaden, Kreidel. 25 Mk.
- Corpus inscriptionum latinarum, consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae editum. Vol. IV. Supplementum. Pars I.: Tabulae ceratae Pompeis reperta annis 1875 et 1887, edita a Car. Zangemeister. Folio. Pp. 273 to 454, engravings. Berlin, Reimer. 16 Mk.
- Cug* (E.) Le Colonat partiaire dans l'Afrique ro-

- maine d'après l'inscription d'Hendrir Mettich. 4to. 68 pp. Paris, Klincksieck.
- Cybulski* (St.) Tabulae, quibus antiquitates graecae et romanae illustrantur. Tab. IV. Navigia. (Coloured plate.) 565-74 cm. St. Petersburg. 4 Mk.
- Danielsson* (O. A.) Zur metrischen Dehnung im ältern griechischen Epos. 8vo. 74 pp. Upsala. 1 Mk. 50.
- (Aus 'Skrifter utgifna af K. humanistiska vetenskapssamfundet i Upsala'.)
- Dio Cassius*. Dionis Cocceiani, Cassii, historiarum romanarum quae supersunt, ed. U. P. Boissevain. Vol. II. Adjecta sunt specimina phototypica duo. 8vo. xxxi, 690 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 28 Mk.
- Dio Prusensis*. Arnim (H. von) Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa, mit einer Einleitung: Sophistik, Rhetorik, Philosophie in ihrem Kampf um die Jugendbildung. 8vo. vii, 524 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 15 Mk.
- Empedocles*. Wieck (F.) Sphaeram Empedoclis quae dicitur recensuit et dissertationem adiecit. 8vo. xxxviii, 38 pp. Greifswald.
- Ermatinger* (Em.) Die attische Autochthonensage bis auf Euripides. 8vo. iii, 148 pp. Berlin, Mayer and M. 3 Mk. 60.
- Euripides*. Mosimann (F.) Inwieweit hat Euripides in den 'Hiketiden', der 'Andromache' und den 'Troerinnen' auf politische Konstellationen seiner Zeit angespielt? 8vo. 77 pp. Bern.
- Festgabe für Franz Susemihl. Zur Geschichte griechischer Wissenschaft und Dichtung. 8vo. v, 93 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk.
- Fisch* (K.) Tarracina Anxur und Kaiser Galba im Romane des Petronius Arbitr. 8vo. 43 pp. Berlin, Gärtner. 1 Mk. 20.
- Fischer* (P.) Quaestiones de Atheniensium sociis historicae. 8vo. 34 pp. Bonn.
- Fragmenta scaenicae Romanorum poesis, tertiis curis rec. O. Ribbeck. Vol. II. Comiorum romanorum praeter Plautum et Syri quae feruntur sententias fragmenta. 8vo. viii, 393 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 5 Mk.
- Höck* (A.) and L. Pertsch, P. W. Forchhammer, ein Gedenkblatt. Mit Anhang: Briefe von und an Forchhammer. 8vo. 290 pp., portrait, and 1 plate. Kiel, Eckardt. 5 Mk.
- Homerus*. Bach (Jos.) Homerische Formenlehre. 8vo. 55 pp. Münster, Aschendorff. 60 Pf.
- Horatius*. Carmina, tertium recogn. L. Mueller. Ed. maior. 12mo. iv, 303 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk.
- Janowski* (C.) Observationes in nomina vestium a tragicis graecis prolata. 8vo. 44 pp. Berlin.
- Kellner* (J.) Römische Baureste in Hidze bei Sarajevo. 8vo. 32 pp., 10 plates and 127 engravings. Wien, Gerold. 2 Mk.
- Küchtnr* (K.) Entstehung und ursprüngliche Bedeutung des spartanischen Ephorats. 8vo. 61 pp. München, Buchholz. 1 Mk. 80.
- Kühner* (R.) Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. 3rd edition. Part II. (in 2 vols.) Satzlehre, neu bearbeitet von G. Berth. Vol. I. 8vo. ix, 666 pp. Hannover, Hahn. 12 Mk.
- Levison* (W.) Die Beurkundung des Civilstandes im Altertum. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Bevölkerungsstatistik. 8vo. 82 pp.
- Livius*. Fugner (F.) Lexicon Livianum. Fasc. VIII. 8vo. vi, pp. and columns 1377 to 1572. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.
- Weber (A.) Beiträge zur Quellenkritik des Livius besonders für die Geschichte des römisch-karthagischen Krieges in Spanien, 218—206. 8vo. 49 pp. Marburg.
- Ludwich* (A.) Bemerkungen zu den Inschriften der ilischen Tafeln und zu Bakchylides. Mit Anhang von O. Rossbach. 4to. 13 pp. Königsberg. 30 Pf.
- Lyceurgus*. Kondratiew (S.) Index ad oratorem Lyceurgum. 8vo. v, 29 pp. Moscow. 3 Mk. 50.
- Marcus Diaconus*. Nuth (A.) De Marci Diaconi vita Porphyrii episcopi Gazensis quaestiones historicae et grammaticae. 8vo. 61 pp.
- Patsch* (C.) Die griechisch-römischen Privatsammlungen Bosniens und der Herzegovina. 8vo. 4 pp., 6 engravings. Wien, Gerold. 20 Pf.
- Archäologisch-epigraphische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der römischen Provinz Dalmatien. Part II. 8vo. 65 pp., 123 engravings. Wien, Gerold. 2 Mk. 40.
- Peters* (Emil.) Der griechische Physiologus und seine orientalischen Uebersetzungen. 8vo. vi, 106 pp. Berlin, Calvary. 3 Mk.
- Petronius*. Segebede (Jo.) and E. Lommatsch, Lexicon Petronianum. 8vo. ix, 274 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 14 Mk.
- Phaedrus*. Zander (C. M.) De generibus et libris paraphrasium Phaedrianarum. 4to. 42 pp. Lund.
- Plato*. Schöler (H.) Augustinus' Verhältnis zu Plato in genetischer Entwicklung. 8vo. 122 pp. Jena.
- Apologie und Kriton mit Stücken aus dem Symposium und dem Phaidon, herausgegeben von A. von Bamberg. Text. 8vo. xv, 123 pp. Bielefeld, Velhagen & K. 1 Mk. 20.
- Schneider (G.) Die Weltanschauung Platos dargestellt im Anschluss an den Dialog Phaidon. 8vo. xiv, 138 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 Mk. 40.
- Polemon*. Juettner (H.) De Polemonis Rhetoris vita, operibus, arte. I. 8vo. 37 pp. Breslau.
- Propertius*. Elegien, erklärt von M. Rothstein. 2 vols. 8vo. xviii, 375, 384 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 12 Mk.
- Quintilianus*. Messer (A.) Quintilian als Didaktiker und sein Einfluss auf die didaktisch-pädagogische Theorie des Humanismus. 8vo. 136 pp. Giessen.
- Rohde* (Erw.) Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen. 2nd edition. 2 vols. 8vo. vii, 329 and iii, 436 pp. Freiburg, Mohr. 20 Mk.
- Sammlung der griechischen Dialektinschriften von I. Baunack, F. Bechtel, A. Bezenberger u. A. Herausgegeben von H. Colditz und F. Bechtel. Vol. III., Part II. Fasc. I. cont.: Meister (R.) Die Inschriften von Lakonien, Tarent, Herakleia (am Siris) und Messenien. 8vo. 146 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & K. 4 Mk. 40.
- Sitzler* (J.) Jahresbericht über die griechischen Lyriker (mit Ausnahme Pindars), Bukoliker, die Anthologia Palatina und die Epigrammensammlungen, für 1891—1894. 8vo. 204 pp. Berlin, Calvary. 7 Mk. 80.
- (Aus 'Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der class. Altertumswissenschaft'.)
- Sophocles*. Fritzsche (F.) De particulae ΟΥΔΕ usu Sophocleo. 8vo. 44 pp. Rostock.
- Oidipus auf Kolonos. Text und Commentar von Ch. Muff. 8vo. 191 pp. Bielefeld, Velhagen & K. 1 Mk. 80.
- Hintner (F.) Der Pflichtenstreit der Agamemnonskinder in Sophokles' Elektra und seine Lösung. 2 parts. 8vo. 34, 18 pp. Laibach.
- Sulpicius Severus*. La chronique de Sulpice Sévère. Texte critique, traduction et commentaire. Livre I. avec prologomènes par A. Lavertujon. 4to. cxxiii, 318 pp. Paris, Hachette. 10 fr.